THE COMING
English Republic:
ITS ADVENT
Justified by Facts, Figures, Arguments, and Authorities.

"The people at large may always quash the vain pretensions of the few by saying—we, collectively, are richer, wiser, and nobler than you."

—*Aristotle.*

"It is the third Gate of Barbarism—the Monarchical Gate, which is closing at this moment. The nineteenth century hears it rolling on its hinges."

—*Victor Hugo.*

"Their swords and their sceptres I floating see,
Like wrecks on the surge of eternity."

—*Shelley.*

LONDON:

HENRY CATTELL & Co., 84, FLEET STREET.

1882.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

General Introduction, showing the object of this Work and its principles, and that the English people are fit for Representative Government 5

CHAPTER II.

Parliamentary Government: Its Origin, History, and Tendency 10

CHAPTER III.

The English Mode of Extending Political Rights, and the ultimate results which may be fairly expected to affect the Throne, the Church, the Lords and Commons, and the Military Forces 18

CHAPTER IV.

Republicanism Explained, and shown to be legal and practicable in Great Britain 30

CHAPTER V.

Popular Objections to Republican Principles Stated and Answered 39

CHAPTER VI.

The Crown of England, and its Cost 51

CHAPTER VII.

The Republic of America: What it is, and What it has done for Mankind 86

CHAPTER VIII.

The Ancient Governments of Greece and Rome: What they were, and What they were not 130

CHAPTER IX.

The Republic of France 139

CHAPTER X.

The Republic of Switzerland 148

CHAPTER XI.

Opinions, Ancient and Modern, in favour of Representative Government 160

AUTHORS QUOTED IN THIS WORK.

BENTHAM.

BOYD, SIR WILLIAM.

BRIGHT, RT. HON. J.

BRADLAUGH, C.

BUCKLE, T. H.

DILKE, SIR CHARLES.

DIXON, W. H.

GAMBETTA, M.

HEGEL.

HONEYWOOD, ST. JOHN.

LEWIS, SIR G. C.

MACINTOSH, SIR J.

MILL, J. S.

MONTESQUIEU.

PARTRIDGE, J. A.

PHILLIPS, WENDELL.

PRIESTLEY, DR.

SMITH, GOLDWIN

SYDNEY, ALGERNON.

WATTS, C.

ZINCKE, REV. F. B.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

As the advanced views of speakers and writers on the subject of Government now obtain a more extensive hearing, a wider circulation, and a greater number of readers than in any preceding age in the history of mankind, it appears opportune to give a comprehensive statement of the general principles on which free institutions are and should be based. More particularly does it seem appropriate that a manifesto of Republican principles and Republican practice should be issued in the English language and among the English people, from whom there sprung into existence during the past century one of the largest and most successful Republics ever instituted by men in the known and recorded history of the world. That the people who speak the English tongue, which bids fair to become the most universally spoken among all the languages of the earth, are entitled to possess the wisest and most equitable Government which the civilised races of the

world can adopt, will scarcely be disputed by any intelligent unit of the Anglo-Saxon race. Even the pious Wordsworth writes: "We must be free or die—who speak the tongue that Shakespeare spake, the faith and morals hold which Milton held." The suitability of the English people for a Republic, and the suitability of that for them, can only be qualified, if at all, by a question of time and circumstance; for there is no advantage in a Republic which they are not entitled to enjoy, nor is there any characteristic of the race which renders them incapable of instituting one and conforming to it. The truth of these statements is sufficiently attested by the fact that Englishmen originated the great American Republic. Since its establishment some millions of the inhabitants of Great Britain have found a home in the United States, where they have experienced an amount of comfort and freedom they never possessed in the islands of their birth and the home of their fathers. They have, moreover, found Republican institutions congenial to their feelings, and in harmony with their highest intellectual conceptions of political justice. Whatever faults and defects belong to the present existing political institutions of America, Englishmen never return to their native land with any complaint that individual well-being is restricted by the Government on the other side of the Atlantic. Some few individuals may

come back with deeply-rooted prejudices in favour of kingly rule, and against the system of equality developed in America, and perhaps with a story of their failure to achieve commercial success; but this may be attributed to natural perversity, or an inherent love of despotism, and to the non-compliance with conditions the observance of which is necessary to success in the New World. All political institutions are governed by conditions, and like everything that is human, are affected favourably or otherwise by circumstances. The best Government appears to some persons only evidence of the fall of man—as a sort of medicine, which, if we were healthy, we should neither require nor take. Men with well-born and well-trained bodies would deem drugs offensive, and men with educated and well-trained minds would deem laws an imposition. Men of cultivated intellects will only obey laws of their own making, or which have their approval; and no power of king, priest, or noble can obliterate this sense of justice from their minds. It is manifest that the stability of a Government must rest on the attachment of the people, and that the power of the laws does not lie in the laws themselves, but in the interest which a people has in obeying and supporting them. All Governments which aim at being the masters, instead of the servants, of the people, must rest on a state of undisturbed and perpetuated ignorance, which is

necessarily accompanied by criminality and pauperism, of which it is the parent. A Government which is the servant of the people, and which is instituted for that reason, every man recognises, and feels an active interest in; while every member of the State, when instructed in the laws, obeys them as his friend, from which he expects protection, and to which he looks for the redress of all grievances which the law is capable of redressing. The general object of social institutions is to reform or improve mankind; hence arises the question, Which is the best way to do it? To our mind, above and before all other methods is the one that makes them freest from temptation and vice—which can best be accomplished by rendering them happier. Happiness may not be the sole end of existence, but the chief aim of all rational Government should be to secure it, to preserve it, to increase its amount, and to promote its diffusion among all the governed. Granting that this is the purpose of State institutions, there appears to follow, as a consequence, that that Government is best which allows the development of such institutions. It is, therefore, obvious that the Government which leaves people to themselves, or which interferes with them the least, is the best adapted for a nation. All rational Governments subsist on the affections of a people, and should have in themselves no power but what is derived. Any other

Government must be either childish or cruel. There are two states or conditions, intellectually speaking, which make two different kinds of Government possible: one is where the people reason, and the other where the people are ignorant and incapable of reasoning. The first sanctions a Republic by approval and appreciation, and the second permits the rule of brute force; the first necessitates intellect and political talent, while the other only requires custom, fear, and force. The origin of the principle of representation was the result of a man allowing the king or the Government to tax him. That is, when a king wanted supplies he had to consult the people of three different classes; and hence their share in the power. The popular contention, that taxation without representation is robbery, may also be traced to this ancient custom. Herein is also embodied the best sense of the term Democracy—that is, impartiality in the laws.

CHAPTER II.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND.

In a work of this character, proposing, as it does, to establish a Republican Government in Great Britain, and to unite all the islands, colonies, etc., in a federated assembly, it is of the highest importance to ascertain how far the past history of the race justifies the proposals. Throughout English history there have been people, not only favourable to, but anxious for, the establishment of the only just system of Government. In this matter it is extremely necessary that the desires and struggles in this century for political freedom should be placed to the credit of the right class in the nation; not to the king, the lords, or the public, but to the PEOPLE. Nothing would be easier to maintain than that the kings, lords, and aristocracy of England have always been, as they are now, favourable to aristocratic Government and kingly rule. There is also another indisputable fact, that they have always considered it a duty to themselves and their country to strenuously oppose every attempt to extend the principles of Democracy. The few who

have at times professed to take sides with the people in favour of Radicalism have invariably found an excuse for retiring into a state of profound Töryism, in order to stem the tide of Democracy so soon as it gathered force.

In order, therefore, to understand arguments used in the name of England, we must at once admit that, excluding the people, this country has always been Monarchical. It is, consequently, true to assert that the rulers of England have always favoured King, Church, and Constitution of some kind.

Granting, however, all that may or can be said in favour of this view, we think we shall be able to show, from our own study of the question, and from authorities at our command, that all the serious and sensible efforts to promote political changes of any magnitude and importance in Great Britain have been in the direction of the application and the extension of the representative system of Government. If we are successful in proving this point, it will form the corner-stone, the very foundation, of an impregnable argument in favour of Republican Government in Great Britain.

The difference between the Governments of England and France is illustrated by Sir William Temple and Napoleon I.—Sir William holding that the Prince should govern all by all, and Napoleon everything for the people, and nothing by the

people. In the time of Edward I. the Archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter to the Pope, informed him that it was the custom of England, in matters political, to take the advice of and consult all interested in them. Although the accuracy of this statement has been disputed, we have the assurance of Hallam that men of all ranks possessed legal equality from the time of Edward III.; and he is distinctly of opinion that to the democratic elements introduced, the English Monarchy owes its permanent character and present existence. That there must have been great activity during that reign is evident from the fact that there were 48 sessions of Parliament, which amounted to nearly annual Parliaments. It was apparently during that reign that the two Houses were formed—the Lords supporting the Throne, and the Commons being the party of progress. In the time of Henry VI. the Commons began to prepare their own Bills in their own House, and to send them up to the Lords. Soon after this it became a custom for the Lords also to prepare their own Bills. During that reign the extraordinary complaint was made of an excessive number of people of "smaller substance" taking part in the elections, and it was enacted that only those who had free land or tenement, to the value of forty shillings a year, in the counties where they lived, should vote for knights of the shire, which is the practice observed to-day.

It was in Henry VI.'s. reign that boroughs were incorporated. Only residents were burgesses, and, according to Hallam, it was the custom to elect representatives from among their own body. Many boroughs neglected to elect representatives, owing to the expense—it being the custom to pay both county and borough members their regular wages, even to the time of Henry VIII. It may be necessary to observe that during all the early centuries the working classes and labourers were excluded from the franchise. It must be confessed that political power did not reach below the middle-class ; the franchise was limited to owners of property and tax-payers.

It is, therefore, clear that the English Constitution was not based on universal suffrage, or even on the right of the majority to rule. Nevertheless, Henry VIII. (who, like his cardinal, was heartily cursed by the people) wrote a letter to the Pope, telling him that the English Parliament was free, that it determined everything for itself in the interest of the commonwealth, and that the Crown had no control over it. It is, however, clear, that subsequent kings did control Parliament, as is evidenced by the struggles that took place from the passing of the Petition of Rights, in 1629, to the restoration of Charles II. How effectually this control was overcome is manifest ; for Absolute Monarchy disappeared for ever, and there was not even an attempt to restore the atrocious

instruments by which Royalty had misgoverned the country. A lingering fear of the people still survived, for one statute (13 Car. II, st. 1, c. 5) enacts that no person shall repair to his Majesty, or either of the Houses of Parliament, on pretence of presenting any petition or complaint, accompanied at any one time with above the number of ten persons—which Act remains unrepealed. Perhaps the Act of Settlement (1770) contains the plainest statement of the Democratic spirit, for Article iv. is as follows:—"And whereas the law of England is the birthright of the people thereof, and all the kings and queens who shall ascend the throne of this realm ought to administer the government of the same according to these laws;" and it goes on to include all officers and institutions under them. Still, it would be misleading to omit the fact, elsewhere alluded to, that this does *not* prevent the king calling to his Court profligates, buffoons, and parasites. Neither does it prevent the king selecting the Ministers he prefers, or excluding any he objects to. Moreover, he can obstruct and delay the people's preferences from taking office, or his own from giving up office.

The king's power over a Parliament which does not prove agreeable to him, and the influence exercised by his friends and admirers, may also be for the time more potent than the laws. The long reign of George III. affords some light on this aspect of the question,

and the mischief he and "his friends" did will not easily pass away from the memories of Englishmen who believe in Democracy. There does not appear to be any instance since the time of Charles II. of the Crown creating boroughs for the purpose of "making" members. This power was transferred to wealthy families, who gave indirect support to the Crown in what are popularly known as rotten boroughs. This move interfered with the aristocratic interest; hence the great landed gentry made desperate efforts to exclude all classes except their own. In the reign of Anne they succeeded in excluding all from the House of Commons except those who possessed estates in the counties worth £600 a year, or, if in boroughs, £300 per annum—that is, only a landed qualification was permitted. This qualification was abolished only so recently as 1858, although the provisions of the old Act had long before been evaded, and relegated to the region of political fiction.

A question of considerable interest during the existence of Parliament, and which survives even to the present day, was what is termed the duration of Parliament. In Edward II.'s reign a statute declared that it was needful the king should hold a Parliament once a year at least; and in the following reign it was ordained that such should be held every year, "and more often, if need be." In 1642 it was enacted that Parliaments should be triennial. By the

special request of Charles II., this was repealed, and his Parliament sat seventeen years. When the sensible proposal was made to restore the old order of things, King William vetoed it; but the Triennial Bill was ultimately passed in 1694. The present Septennial Act was passed in 1717, principally, it would seem, to avoid a general appeal to the nation in that year, which might not have been advantageous to the new king.

The greatest change ever made in the interests of Democracy occurred in 1832, when the members for England and Wales were increased from 95 to 159. Of the then existing boroughs, whose history was a disgrace to all parties, 56 were disenfranchised, and 31 others partially so, while 43 new boroughs were created, one-half having two members, and the others one each. The forty-shilling freeholders still kept their place, and a high rental qualified others—the most important new element being the £10 householders in cities and boroughs, subject to ratal qualification. Thus political power partially descended from the landed aristocracy and the wealthy families to those who have now received the title of the middle-classes—persons occupying a position next above the useful classes. How little this measure affected persons below the middle class is evident from the fact that twenty years after the Reform Bill was passed there were three millions of people—degraded, ignorant,

miserable—receiving parish relief in one year. Nearly one-half of the people were unacquainted with the name of the Saviour, and were unable to read, not knowing even the months of the year. Two-thirds of a thousand of our criminal population, although ignorant of all else, showed an acquaintance with the Turpin and Sheppard histories. The fact that one million people were chargeable on the rates, and entirely supported out of them, does not assure us that the lot of the unfortunate was visibly affected by political reform.

The next political change in our Parliamentary history occurred so recently as 1867, and is therefore fresh in the memory of all grown persons. The Reform Bill of 1867 restored something like a state of things supposed to have existed centuries before—household suffrage. Next to conferring political rights on the man, it is doubtless the next best thing to confer them on his house. This was done in 1867, in the large towns; but those outside the border lines of boroughs were not included in the privilege.

From these facts may be gleaned an idea of the origin and development of Parliamentary history. Although not reaching the stage of pure and undefiled Democracy, there is an indication all through that the people of England desire to be free; and they are now contemplating adding another chapter to the history of English political freedom.

CHAPTER III.

THE MODE OF PROMOTING POLITICAL FREEDOM IN ENGLAND, AND THE CHANGES WHICH MAY RESULT FROM AN EXTENSION OF IT.

THE representative system is not practical except under conditions in harmony therewith. General intelligence, means of spreading knowledge, of exchanging thought, of creating enlightened public opinion and awakening a general interest in public affairs—all these are necessary to just rule, in accordance with the popular will as expressed by the popular vote.

To secure the existence of free institutions, the people must have not only a desire for them, but also a full understanding of their nature and objects. In order to bring about this state of things, it has always appeared to us most useful to advocate, and to show the importance of, the best form of civil Government among men as a system of preliminary education.

Which is the best form of civil Government to promote among mankind, must be ascertained after deciding for what purpose and among what people Government is to be instituted. While it is true that no Government can of itself do any people much good, yet any Government is undoubtedly capable of inflicting unlimited mischief and misery on a whole people; hence the purpose of a Government made by an intelligent people for themselves would be the promotion of progress and the enforcement of whatever good the community might demand and require. That there are degrees and limits in all human affairs, no one disputes; but the more comprehensive the will or opinion of a people is expressed, the greater will be the possible chances that whatever good is done for the community will be shared among the greatest number. The best form of popular Government would, therefore, be that which promoted the intellectual, moral, and physical good of the whole people, or which would allow all the social laws to operate in such a way as to enable the intelligent and industrious to become the tranquil possessors of available sources of all good things. Not only must the best civil Government protect life and property; it must lead the people, by its mode of procedure, to regard life, in all its varied forms and relations, as above and before property. The best civil Government is not only a protector of order, a system of police, supplemented

by an army; it must also include the idea of progress, without which order is only another name for despotism and tyranny, of which Europe has had an example in this century, which ought to be a caution and a warning for all time. It may, however, be admitted that occasionally the exercise of power and influence by one man may not only be tolerated, but may save the nation from tyranny on the one hand, or confusion on the other. Cincinnatus, Washington, Cromwell, Gambetta, and a few others, are instances and illustrations of this possible but dangerous state of human affairs. No number of examples, however good and great, can destroy the conclusion, which must be logically arrived at by every thoughtful and candid person, that the supreme and controlling power, the sovereignty of a nation, must ultimately rest in the aggregate of its people; giving each person an equal and active opportunity of exercising the public function which a popular vote confers. That such an appeal to the universal sense and interest, or universal sentiment, in all nations and under all conditions, is not practicable, in no way disproves its superiority in cases where the conditions of its existence—as in America and France—are to be found. Of course, there are nations to whom such an appeal would be meaningless—such nations being strangers to all modern ideas of civil liberty and personal freedom. In England it would be understood,

but could not be responded to under the existing limited suffrage and the extremely partial distribution of political power. The preservation of the rights of free speech, free Press, and public meeting, which are among the triumphs of the English Democracy—hardly-won and dearly-bought privileges—will, it is hoped, ultimately enable the people to obtain political power in the House of Commons itself. At present the English system of democratic rule means that a majority of those who possess the vote rule the country, although this is neutralised by the anomalous distribution of seats. It seems strange that eminent writers should concern themselves so deeply and seriously with regard to the possible rule of England by the whole of the people, and even offer checks as preventives of the evils which they imagine may result. Surely it would be more philosophical to wait till there is some proposal made to give the English people political power—which is by no means likely to occur in any sudden or unexpected manner. In England all concessions to the popular demand have been so slowly made that a generation of men live and die without seeing any change; and we are even now obliged to subsist on the hope that the promised extension of political privileges will be enjoyed by generations unborn.

The only disqualification that will bear the light of public criticism is based on some offence against the

laws of the country, and whenever such disqualification takes place it should apply to all men equitably, whether high or low, rich or poor. All other obstacles to the exercise of political rights in a free State are obvious infringements of the law of universal justice. The strongest point made against the masses during the last Reform agitation in England for an extension of the suffrage was that they ought to be excluded on account of their ignorance. But their want of education was owing to the indifference and neglect of those above them, and in whose power was the establishment of national schools. The impracticability of enforcing an educational test was, however, shown by the fact that it would have disfranchised a great body of electors who had exercised the vote for generations. On investigation, it will be generally found that among those of the working classes who are excluded there is far more political knowledge than exists among the class next above them, on whom the law has conferred the right of citizenship—conferred it, it should be remembered, on account of their possessions, and not on account of their general knowledge of national affairs or of political science. The educational test, to be fair, and not to make invidious distinctions, must include the wealthy and the wealthless. This would probably work more in favour of poor men than against them, if a knowledge of political Government were the passport to political rights. But it has been

found only possible to make arrangements which embrace men regardless of the amount of their property, the state of their education, or their intellectual acquirements of any kind. The only limit to the popular vote is, not that a person shall be tested or taxed, but that his *house* shall, in some way or other, directly or indirectly, contribute to local and national taxation. This being the law of the land, conditions of voting and qualifications of voters are no longer subjects of discussion. There is a possibility that this principle may be extended to all adults, under what would be termed registered suffrage; but this would be no novelty, as it would be merely an expansion of what is now known as the lodger franchise. This, then, being conceded, there would be a consistent, intelligible, rational basis in England for the establishment of a genuine representative system of Government. Moreover, such an extension would not only do no violence to any cherished notions of the past, but would be in harmony with the mode of procedure adopted throughout the history of Parliamentary reform. It would be but a continuation of what was begun in real earnest by the men of 1832—

> "Freedom's battle once begun,
> Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
> Though baffled oft, is ever won."

Those who accept the validity of this reasoning will at once see that the result of carrying out the principles

involved would be the inevitable abolition or entire remodelling of the House of Lords as it at present exists—that is, if any Second Chamber is desired or considered essential for carrying on the legislation of the country, it must be established on the principle of election, either by the people or their representatives. On this subject even Radicals differ; but the examples of existing Republics in other countries, each of which has a Second House, would probably be taken as evidence of greater weight in favour of two Chambers than any abstract argument against the institution of a second Elective Chamber in this country.

It is useless to ignore the fact that there is a disposition among many speakers to discountenance the consideration of the question of Government in the detailed, particularised manner adopted in this volume. But our object is to make perfectly clear what reforms are necessary, and what consequences would inevitably follow the adoption of those reforms; and not only to do this, but to illustrate each argument by a reference to existing institutions, so that the humblest reader may not only understand us, but not misunderstand us. Nothing is more common than to describe Republicans as theorists, and their principles as paper constitutions; and it is customary to speak of detailed, formulated plans of Government as philosophical deductions, as Utopias, as castles built in the air. It will be our endeavour, in these pages, to dissipate

some of these illusions by showing the practicability of the Republican programme.

The arguments urged against the extension of political power are based either on prejudice or on the alleged unfitness of certain persons to be admitted into the charmed circle. The accusation of unfitness is certainly supported by formidable facts. But arguments based upon them become two-edged swords, which are as likely to cut the user as the other person. Unfitness is not confined to persons of inferior rank. The person who will take sides in an election because he or his friends are benefited, and the person who will take a five or a fifty-pound note or accept a credit account at the candidate's banker's, are just the persons who consider a poor man unfit, on the ground that he might part with his vote for a "pot of beer." In discussing the fundamentals of Government, it is obviously not the prerogative of any class to exclude any other class from accession to power. It is an unwarranted arrogance, which is no more justifiable when exercised by an exclusive merchant, manufacturer, or other person of influence, than it is in the case of conquerors or a landed aristocracy.

Those who agree that the king and the hereditary lords would naturally disappear under the transformation of England into a Republic, will also concede that the disestablishment of the State Church, which endows and gives a legal status to one form of faith,

overshadowing all other forms of faith in the State, is utterly at variance with that equality which all Republicans agree should prevail. There is also another institution whose existence, in its present form, will not be maintained under the people's rule; I mean the Army and Navy, these combined forces constituting the standing army. This much-venerated institution in modern Europe is a standing menace to all possible progress and civilisation among mankind. That the country should have a national defence by sea and land, no one disputes; but as to whether the present standing army is the most suitable, economical, and efficient defence, is quite another matter, upon which much difference of opinion is sure to arise. Standing armies are standing dangers to the peace of the world. All sensible Republicans are opposed to war and in favour of peace. It is an enormous tax on the poor man's earnings to provide food, and lodgings, and clothes for a whole class of men, numbered by thousands, who never contribute anything whatever to the commonwealth, but considerably increase its indebtedness. If the industrial classes of Europe were to combine in their own interests against this armed force (which forms a barrier between the people and their rights and social well-being), and refuse any longer to support standing armies, the kings and emperors of the earth would dissolve into thin air, and all their pomp and vanity, their gorgeous

palaces and solemn processions, would cease for ever to trouble and vex mankind. The best provision England can make for her own defence and security against all possible enemies is to raise a volunteer army for *that purpose only*, leaving the making war upon, and conquests of, all the other nations of the earth to the barbarians who are the supporters and followers of kings and emperors. So long as the profession of a soldier is held in estimation by the people, civilisation will be retarded and incomplete. To a soldier, *as a soldier*, there is no such thing as right and wrong: of justice and mercy he has no conception, for his trade admits of no just and merciful way of murdering and ruining a nation. The profession which necessarily involves cruelty and injustice is no honour to mankind. The great use of standing armies in all ages has been to prop up the despots of the earth, who have been a burden and a curse to the world. The soldier lives on others, and is paid to extort from them—by force, if necessary—their property and their freedom, in the interests and at the will of his employer; and the ablest defence that has ever been made for him is that he protects the plundered people from foreign robbers. War is not a modern invention, neither is the doctrine of peace, for the former was practised long before the Christian era, and the latter was preached at least five hundred years before that era commenced. There is this to be

said in favour of the ancients: they entered on their unjust wars and schemes of plunder without any lying declaration about being compelled to do so, and without invoking the blessing of the gods on their mission of murder and robbery. Modern kings appear to wish to kill people because the soldiers are unemployed —just to keep their hand in, or to satisfy their lust for power, or to perpetuate their senseless quarrels with one another. But—

> "War's a game which, were their subjects wise,
> Kings would not play at."

The two greatest evils that have afflicted mankind during the past hundred years have been war and revolution, neither of which has resulted from the deliberate choice of persons educated under Republican institutions or inspired by Republican sentiments. The American War was the result of Monarchical stupidity and injustice, and the revolution or civil war in the same country was caused by slavery—a legacy the Republicans inherited from the same English Monarchy. The French Revolution was carried out by men who had been trained under the French Monarchy, and the revolting features exhibited at the time are clearly traceable to antecedent causes—the consequences of Monarchical misrule in that country. The English Revolution introduced new limits to the power of kings and more radical notions of Government. The same may be said of Italy, which has recently been greatly benefited by a successful

revolution. Although it is no part of a Republican's creed to initiate revolutions, yet the triumph of America over the calamity of a civil war, and the extraordinary progress of France since her German foes' most direful infliction, show beyond all dispute the enormous power of a free people to overcome the most gigantic evils. It is doubtful if any existing Monarchy could have escaped destruction if exposed to similar evils, the extent of which is unknown in the previous history of mankind. Revolutions have been called human lotteries, speculation in which ought to be avoided. This may be so, but in the cases of England, America, Italy, and France, we cannot deny the existence of some prizes. Whatever exception may be taken to individuals or to incidents connected with either or all of these revolutions, the fact remains that they conferred privileges, happiness, and freedom upon whole nations. No Monarchy in the world has ever been or can be compared with even the attempts to establish Republican institutions, in so far as the extension of human rights and human comfort is concerned. The removal of artificial and legal distinctions among men in America and France, and the opening up of a career for every man in agriculture or trade, freed from the foolish and wicked restrictions of feudal barbarism—these alone will have an undying interest for posterity as long as the world shall last.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLE EXPLAINED, AND ITS APPLICATION TO ENGLAND SHOWN TO BE LEGAL AND PRACTICABLE.

On no less an authority than that of Mr. Bright, it is contended that the present Parliament will complete the Reform Bill begun in 1832. Manifestly, therefore, we may expect that within a few years a uniform household suffrage, if not adult suffrage, will be established throughout the whole United Kingdom; besides which, there is to be a redistribution of seats, so that representation may be co-existent with population or taxation, or with both. When these measures are carried they will be only the means to ends yet, perhaps, far off.

Be the time near or distant, the land laws of the United Kingdom will demand in this generation very serious attention, as will also the connection between the religion of a certain class of the people with the State—the section known as the Church of England as by law established. These and other questions

will lead up to a remodelling of the whole system of Government, and to an inquiry as to the fundamental basis on which a just and permanent one should be instituted.

There are three standard forms of Government, recognised by all writers, to which may be given intelligible definitions: the first being that of one man; the second, that of a small number of men; and the third, that of a large number of men; and they have been named respectively—Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Commonwealth. In history they are sometimes described as Tyranny, Oligarchy, and Democracy. These have all varied in their constituent elements in different ages of the world. The most perfect of all of them will be found in a State where the laws rule the most, and the person or persons rule the least. The English Government is described as consisting of all of these combined under one name, but each part acting as a check on each other part. There is one feature in the English system which is peculiar to itself—that is, what is called the Cabinet. It is practically the Sovereign power which decides the domestic and foreign policy of the empire. Yet it is nowhere prescribed for in the legal Constitution, nor does it publish any record of its proceedings, even if it keeps any, which is doubtful. All that this Cabinet requires to sustain its existence is the confidence of the House of Commons. Neither the House of Lords

nor the Queen seems essential to the English Cabinet. Its power is also manifest in our Colonies and dependencies, where the Governors, who stand to the two Houses as the Crown does at home, receive all their orders, not from the Queen, but from the Cabinet and its Colonial Secretary. In the United States, and in most, if not in all, European countries, the chief of the State is surrounded by what is termed a Council of Ministers. At one time, in England, the king exercised the power of dismissing the Ministry; but there is no instance of this having been done since 1834. No Bill has been vetoed since the Scotch Militia Bill by Queen Anne. The chief, if not the only function that the English Crown has now left, is the temporary possession of the power of the Cabinet during the interval between the resignation of a Government and the formation of a new Ministry. Even this is not a legal part of the Constitution, but simply the custom of the country, originating, it is supposed, in the time of George, who did not speak our language, nor understand that of his English Ministers.

It thus appears that the will of the nation is known through the Cabinet, that the Cabinet depends on the House of Commons, and that that depends on the will of the people as expressed by those who have the power to vote in the different constituencies at a general national election. There is nothing fixed;

all may be changed any month in the year in the manner and by the parties herein referred to.

The Queen of England reigns, but does not govern; and the strongest argument in favour of a succession of her family to the Throne is their intellectual incapacity to interfere with the political affairs of the country, which maintains them in a state of munificence. Perhaps the present Queen is as innocent, and has done as little injury to the kingdom, as any monarch that ever reigned. It is doubtful if the Queen has a single enemy in her realm. The people know she was born a Queen, and is the creature of circumstances over which she has no control; hence personal hostility to her would be as foolish as the cause for it is groundless. But when we come to discuss forms of Government the whole aspect of the reigning king or queen is completely changed; it is no longer a question of personal character, but of political principle. Under any rational system of Government the personal virtues or vices of any particular individual are of no national account. It is the *possession of power not under national control* which makes any person, even if an angel from heaven, a source of danger to the interests of the whole people. This, it may be said, does not apply to England; but the Crown of England can, by constitutional law, refuse assent to Acts of Parliament, and may maintain any Minister in office in defiance of Parliament itself. It is no credit to the

system which permits this, to urge that it is not always acted upon. It is no defence of the rightfulness of it to say that supreme power must reside somewhere. That there must be an ultimate controlling power somewhere, admits of no dispute—but controlling power over what? Clearly it is meant a controlling power over the whole people, and there need be no difficulty in showing that it must be self-control; that the people must be *their own masters whenever they please, or whenever the affairs of the nation require a declaration as to who the master is.* That the rights and interests of every person are most likely to be secure when that person looks after them himself, and that the general interests are most likely to be best protected and most efficiently promoted when all are concerned therein, is not only a common-sense view, but is founded on the well-known and universal instincts of mankind. Such persons allow none others to do for them what they can do for themselves. They cease to be dependents, and become self-protecting, independent men. When they combine it is to gain strength, and not to place their necks under a yoke of subjection.

In order to allow the exercise of all the powers of the varied elements which exist in a social state sufficiently enlightened to be self-acting and self-protecting, it is essential that every person should participate in the Government, which has to provide

for all the exigencies of a civilised community. A Parliament of the whole people is admittedly an impossible thing; but one appointed by a whole people is a practical thing, and those who admit the logical force of this reasoning, and also the justice of the arrangements, and the facts concerning the nature of man upon which those arrangements are based, must perforce concede that the only national sequence is Representative Government. This, it may be contended, is the culminating point realised now in England. That the political history of England shows expansion, an enlargement of human rights and personal freedom, is true; but it is also true that the majority of the people have nothing whatever to do with the election or appointment of law-makers or rulers. But supposing they have the prospect of one day becoming part and parcel of the Constitution of their country, when that time arrives England will be a Republic in so far as the simple machinery of Parliament-making is concerned. That this is practical, and no mere theory, will be palpable to any one who reflects on what took place in 1832 and 1867—the fruits of many long years of patriotic and persistent agitation, we are bound to admit. But if the labours of forty years achieved such beneficial results when the people were comparatively uneducated, as well as politically ignorant, we may reasonably predict the completion of the Reform programme in a very few

years. Now that the present generation possess the means of obtaining political knowledge denied to their forefathers, there will not be the same objections to an extension of political power among enlightened people, and the possible dangers of former times cannot be reasonably apprehended. Of course, there is a remnant of the race that admits of no change, and in whose eyes the transfer of any portion of political power to the masses means the destruction of the nation and the placing in peril of all the sacred institutions of the country. But, happily, the survivors of this race are few in number, and are incapable of permanent political mischief. Men cannot help becoming fossils, rocks without life, in the political world. Their principles are stereotyped, are to them fixed and eternal, unalterable by time, and unmodifiable by new circumstances. They are steadfast and immovable, and believe that—

> "Not all the water of the rough, rude sea
> Can wash the balm off an anointed king."

They are, in short, satisfied with things as they are, like Dr. Johnson was of the sun: he was convinced it would last his time, and was content to leave posterity to look out for itself. There is much to be said for ancient institutions, but their age is their chief characteristic. After all, it is not wise in things political to venerate for ever that which is old, but rather that which is useful; for it is manifest that

in the coming time this will be the test of all political institutions. Whatever is useful will be carefully preserved, but everything else will be swept away. To maintain institutions merely because they exist is seldom the only reason given why they should be maintained, even by the enemies of progress; the real reason, expressed or not, is because—

> "The good old rule sufficeth them, the simple plan,
> That they should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can."

Now, supposing the extension of political power an accomplished fact, in harmony with the mode of procedure adopted in England—that is, by gradual extension of the suffrage till it comprehends the adult population—the result would be a Democracy with a king at its head. Although this might not prove an insuperable barrier in the way of progress, the king would certainly be deprived of all power; the question as to the wisdom of maintaining an officer, whose power was abolished, and the cost of whose office would swell the demand for taxes, would sure to be raised, and the end of kingship would speedily arrive. A costly and useless officer would be looked upon as a luxury for which poor people could not afford to pay, and without which nobody would be a farthing the worse. But with the king would pass away also hereditary rule, which implies legal and social inequality; for no sound Democratic institution will

admit men to rule because of their hereditary privileges. It can only accept service from persons who have inherited certain distinctions, on the ground that they possess personal merit, the only nobility recognised under Republican rule, for all other is useless. The distinctions which arise under a Republic are those of wisdom, virtue, skill, and industry.

The abolition of meaningless titles is not an absolute necessity, but the exclusion of their possessors from the right to rule because they possess titles, is essential. Titled people may be no better and no worse than untitled people; but they must take their share only of political power with others, because the object of a Republic is to *make it impossible for the general community to be oppressed or plundered by a few titled families*, or to allow the lives and property of the people to be at their mercy, however well-intentioned they may be. All possible rulers are but men, and it therefore behoves the people, as a matter of common prudence, as well as of political wisdom, to obtain all possible securities which human institutions can give them, trusting to the generosity and forbearance of no man or body of men.

CHAPTER V.

Republicanism Defended: Some Objections Answered.

It is commonly asserted that it is better to be ruled by the intelligent few than by the ignorant many, but that is not the point in dispute, and such an assertion is only the throwing of dust in the eyes of an opponent. The real question is, Who should elect or appoint the intelligent few to govern? The bulk of the arguments against popular rule are beside the mark. It is no answer to the question as to which is the most nutritious kind of food, to say that a rose is more artistically beautiful than a nettle. Moreover, there is no instance of an intelligent few arising in any country to rule beneficially, and in accordance with universal justice, except where they had the approval of the people. There are many instances of the few usurping the power of the many for their own purposes. Be the supposed or imaginary evils of Democratic rule what they may, there is this important fact demonstrated by the testimony of ancient and modern times—that whatever exists in any other form of Government, by whatever name it is known, that is beneficial to the

nation at large or any considerable portion of it, is owing entirely to the presence of the Democratic elements introduced. Exclude all that belongs to Republican principles by common consent in any existing Constitution, and there will be found nothing left but what is characteristic of tyranny, feudalism, or of a state of barbarism, in which the rulers have all power and the people are treated as children or slaves. All other forms of Government except a Republic are naturally not only opposed to the interests of the people, but absolutely hostile to them.

The prophetic declaration, that Democratic rule will ruin national interests, will, if fairly and searchingly analysed, be found to rest on what all sound thinkers who understand the question will admit—namely, that the logical issue of admitting the great industrial order, the millions, to political power will be, that they will legislate for the benefit of themselves and the general community. It is by no means probable that the people will legislate against the interests of the majority of the nation, as the monarchs and aristocrats of the past have done almost without exception. Even in England, within the memory of men now living, our so-called superiors taxed even the children's bread to keep up their rents, and it is no exaggeration to say that the Corn Law of 1815 is an historical record of infamy, an everlasting impeachment of kingly and aristocratic rule, which can never be refuted or denied.

The ancient Republics are quoted as failures; but they, in fact, nearly resembled the condition of things in South America before that great and terrible civil war which burst asunder the chains of the slave and set him free. Political power in ancient times was limited to the free citizens, and was divided among them only, leaving a majority of the people outside the pale even of their so-called Democratic Constitutions. Let us understand, not only that the ancient Republics failed, but what it was that failed. Yet even these were better at their worst than the ancient aristocratic and oligarchic Governments, which excluded free citizens, except such as were qualified by birth, wealth, or some other distinctions. It is doubtful if any politician, or any writer of ancient times, ever conceived the possible existence of a nation of working-men, free and independent, in the same sense as other members of the community; and hence no provision was made even by Plato for such men to exercise their individual rights. Such being the fact, all arguments founded on the failures of ancient Republics are worthless, because the idea of Democracy was never realised in any ancient State or Government. The contention that the majority will rule in their own interests is built on the assumption that the people will act as unjustly as their superiors, the patricians, the nobles, the barons, and others, did before our time: they always legislated and governed in their own interest, and to the detriment of the lives and welfare of the people.

Another specious piece of special pleading against a Republic is, that if all men were equally capable of forming a judgment on political affairs, there would no longer exist any necessity for withholding from them an equal share of political power; but as this is not so, the Republican theory is unsound. The fallacy concealed in this case consists of the assumption that under other forms of Government all the persons concerned with the Government *are* equally competent to judge of political affairs. There is no evidence in the whole civilized world of any such thing: the only qualification hitherto has been that certain persons have the privilege of voting conferred upon them on account of the amount of their property, their rent, their rates, or for some other unimportant reason.

The foolishness talked, after the manner of Pope, in respect to the best form of Government, can hardly impose on the least instructed politician. He says that "Whate'er is best administered is best." One might as well assert that prussic acid is better for the stomach than rhubarb, if the physician is more skilful in administering it to the patient. Such transparent twaddle demands a passing notice, for the most difficult opponent to answer is the one who only makes assertions, and never puts forth any arguments.

No doubt can arise in the minds of those who understand the question, that a form of Government which holds out the chance of promoting the welfare of society

must be better than one which does not, or that the form of Government, in fact, determines the nature of the laws and the method of enforcing them. Hence, the probabilities are in favour of the best laws and the best administration arising under the best form of Government. Certainly no one expects a bad, or the worst Government to pass good laws or rule equitably. It would be as reasonable to expect grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. One fallacy is in attributing certain evils, which may exist under some Republics, to the fact of their being Republics, instead of acknowledging that the evils are the result of causes totally independent of the Republics. To give a broad answer, it may safely be asserted that in any given case where a State is visited by an earthquake, that calamity is neither caused by Republican institutions, nor are its evil results intensified by them. The fact is that, under whatever afflictions mankind have suffered, whether of war, pestilence, slavery, or famine, the Republics have always most quickly recovered from them, as in the case of the Americans after the Civil war, and that of the French after their defeat by the Germans. If a Republic could be instanced in which the reception of new truth is prohibited, or the adoption of new discoveries is proscribed, that would be no invalidation of Republican principles, but only proof of a departure from them. Glass, which lights the house and keeps out the weather, could not be

adopted in the ancient Republics, as it did not exist. Half the globe before the sixteenth century did not know the use of bread and wine, and England did not use the potato till imported from America. But these facts in no way affect the question under discussion. The most advanced opponent of Republican Government is the one who contends that the best form of Government is purely ideal, and not realizable in the present condition of human intelligence and human affairs, generally considered. The answer to this is, that the tendency of the most advanced nations is towards *self-government* and the assertion of individual right; and no number of instances that can be quoted of nations which do not demand this affect in the slightest degree the justice claimed by others. The mere existence of a certain state of things proves nothing against a principle, or the existence of the Devil might prove him to be an angel, and in like manner Bonaparte to be a saint. Notwithstanding that a whole race of people believed that two and two made five, the result of adding two and two would be in no way affected. There are savage races still existing who believe that whatever the king says is right, and who place their heads on the block cheerfully if he says that their heads ought to be severed from their trunks. The value of an institution is not now measured by its age, but by its utility, and not so much by its power to control as by its capacity to serve the people.

One argument against Republican Government is based on the fact that Monarchies have prevailed in Africa and Asia, while in the most ancient nations Republics have never taken root. It may be at once admitted that where men submit to be ruled like children, and to be fed like the young of sparrows and rooks, there is a possible existence for all sorts of imposture and all kinds of tyranny; but surely it cannot be seriously asserted that the practice of tyranny and imposture is worthy of bearing the distinguished name of the best form of civil Government among mankind; and unless this position is contended for, the argument from the East is full of "sound and fury, signifying nothing." A despotic Government may be the fittest for barbarians, but not the best for mankind, or even for barbarians, if their nature admits of improvement.

Probably the most telling argument ever invented to expose the weakness and insufficiency of the Republican form of Government is the one which asserts that the best form may be any form, according to the circumstances, the time, and the people to be governed—that is, that a form of Government, being the result of accident, custom, state of civilisation, etc., may be the best for one nation, and unsuitable for another nation. That the Cannibals, Red Indians, and Hottentots might prefer and adopt a different Government to the one preferred by the English, French, and

Americans, may be true; but it does not affect the argument as to which is the best. Some think it a very weighty argument against Republicanism to instance races existing only as wandering tribes; but the absence of law and order can in no way affect the wise and generous treatment of men under Republican rule. Such opponents might as well call to their aid the fact that other animals besides man roam the forest and haunt the jungle—sometimes to the terror of civilised men. The fact that no stable, lawful Government is possible among certain races, is fatal alike to Monarchical and Republican rule. The question is not whether *all* men are fit for a Democracy, or representative institutions, but whether all men *who are fit* can best realise their aspiration for justice under a system which allows every man a fair and free chance of doing so. Putting Bonaparte on the throne, or permitting him to rule and become the scourge of Europe—carrying war into every nation, and leaving death and pestilence in its track—may have the approval of millions, and gain the admiration of the whole nation; but no person of sane mind would assert that such a mode of governing is best for promoting the comfort and happiness of mankind. Yet there are not wanting persons who are fascinated with a show of brute force and military splendour, lauding it as national glory and honour, and who dignify the wholesale butchers of humanity with the title of heroes.

It is the custom of enemies of Republican institutions to point out the scarcity of Democracies as proof of their unsuitability for mankind. But their scarcity is not owing to the causes alleged; the fact is that selfish monarchs and aristocratic rulers hate and dread Democracy, because it does not admit of the abuses of power which they commonly practise; hence they try to prevent the establishment of all Democracies, and endeavour to destroy all that are established, in spite or in defiance of them. This is the true reason why Democracies are so rare.

Then, again, we are constantly reminded that there is the new-fangled phrase, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," to which the Republican agitation of the present age has directed the attention of mankind. Not so much exception is taken to the words "Liberty" and "Fraternity," as they have been interpreted to mean freedom among men generally, and sympathy growing out of the natural relation that exists in the family of man, but differing from the relation that exists between man and other members of the animal kingdom. But when we approach the terrible word "Equality," there arises a feeling of apprehension, of solemn dread of some revolutionary-levelling process of a violent and disagreeable character.

It is commonly remarked by visitors of an observing class of mind that England is an example to the world of a few rich persons and many poor ones. In some

of the most educated and advanced Monarchies there exists an amount of wealth and splendour unknown in previous history; and by its side has arisen an inequality of the most alarming dimensions. While a few enjoy all the luxuries of existence, the many, or at least a vast multitude, of the same nation, are without almost every comfort and security that make life pleasant or tolerable. The utmost skill and industry only afford the workers the necessaries of life; and where the dependants in a household are numerous and helpless the amount of poverty and wretchedness which prevails cannot be realised except by those who live among what are called "the lower order of social life." Such a condition of things is a source of weakness and danger to the State; for the wealthy, being the few, must contribute most to the State, and hence their tendency to remove the burden on to the shoulders of their poorer brethren. This not only oppresses the poor, but it lessens the comfort and pleasures of the rich. It will be found better for all concerned—better for morality, better for peace and order, better for the security of property and life—that all the people who labour in any way should obtain and possess the results of their labour, and thus share, not only the necessaries of life, but also some portion of the embellishments which distinguish a progressive and civilised state of existence. That some choose to mistake this question of Equality is quite true, but

their exaggerations often defeat their own purposes. One might imagine from reading some writers that Republican equality meant that all men and women should be made by Act of Parliament to be of one height, one weight, and one colour, and to have wants, desires, and tastes exactly alike in quantity, intensity, and character. That all men should have an equal chance in life, be equal before the law, have equal security for life and property, and equal freedom in all things, in no way implies that all should have one coloured hair, or eat off the same plate, or take the food out of the mouth of another who has earned it for himself. In short, the doctrine of Equality is not the creed of lunatics, whatever enemies may assert. What people mean by equality is justice; that every one should have his due—that, in brief, all men should be dealt with, not only according to law, but also according to what is understood by equity. That an average comfort prevailing in all society would add to the general happiness, no one disputes, and the feeling is often exemplified by the wealthy when any sudden calamity overtakes any portion of society, if they are themselves spared from the infliction. It is frequently asserted that Republicans, by raising the standard of comfort in society, mean the taking away of the earnings of the industrious and virtuous, and giving them to the idle and worthless. That there have been instances in the history of the world where the famishing

PAGINATION INCORRECT

multitude have trampled under foot the established notions of the rights of property, and where the unprincipled well-fed have lived on the poor, and robbed them without mercy, under the protection of laws made by themselves for their own interests, need not be denied in the interest of Republicanism. But every free man knows that none but criminals, or such as ought to be so described, would be parties to the division of the hard earnings of the industrious nation among the miscreants that disfigure, and are a reproach to, every class of mankind. That there may be times and seasons when certain persons who have monopolised the wealth and land of a country may be the subject of disestablishment and disendowment, no Republican or honest man can doubt for one moment. But it is one thing to put an end to the abuse of wealth and power by wise and just reformation, and quite another to perpetuate unblushing acts of spoliation and robbery. The first is a fair description of Republican principles operating in a rational way, and the second is the almost opposite description given by their enemies. A Republic means the good of all, and any instances that can be quoted to the contrary are departures from its principles.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CROWN OF ENGLAND: WHAT IT IS, WHAT IT DOES, AND WHAT IT COSTS.

THE throne of England has been several times subjected to the control of Parliament, and is not inheritable against the will of the people and the law of the land. Of the many sovereigns who have ascended the throne since the Norman Conquest, only thirteen have done so by the divine right of kings—that is, hereditary right. Parliament having given the Crown to Charles II. in 1660, and having taken the Crown from James II. in 1688, sufficiently shows that the power of the people over the Crown, as over everything else, is legally supreme. William III. was invited here and made king by the Parliament of England. Nothing can be clearer than this, that the Parliament of England has the same right to exclude the House of Brunswick as it had the House of Stuart, and that it has the same power to legislate without any king at all as it had at the Revolution. That there is nothing sacred in the lives of English kings, nor saintly in their conduct, to create and perpetuate national reverence, is clear to

every person who has read impartially-written English history. To go no farther back than the Revolution, there is little to commend itself to the intelligent and virtuous mind in the conduct of any ruler preceding Queen Victoria. George I. was chiefly notable for his ignorance of England, George II. for his absence from England, George III. for his mental aberrations, and George IV. for his moral delinquencies. William IV. was remarkable mostly for his obstinacy, but, fortunately for the people, his anxiety to retain the Crown overpowered his antagonistic feelings towards political progress. The history of these monarchs is devoid of interest, except to show the extent to which political baseness is possible among rulers in high places. They found us with a small national debt, and left us saddled with nearly 800 millions. The annual expenditure under their rule was about the only progressive measure they were associated with—it was about £36,000,000 when the Elector of Hanover first visited us; it is now over £86,000,000. It is worth recording that George III. and "the king's friends" were more successful in increasing the public burdens than any other member of his house, for during his reign the national debt was increased from £150,000,000 to £900,000,000. The king and "the king's friends" were not successful in entirely suppressing freedom at home and abroad, but they did their best.

Whatever may be said for or against the wearer of the Crown of England to-day, there can be no charge

sustained against the Queen in respect to the progress of taxation. The expenditure in poor rates has increased nearly 50 per cent., and the Imperial taxation has increased more than 50 per cent. during her Majesty's happy and prosperous reign. There is one statement constantly repeated which we are unable to deny, and which cannot be proved from any published documents with which we are acquainted. The statement is, that the Queen is, and her late husband was, very wealthy. There is another fact about which there can be no dispute, and which tends to make the statement incredible in the minds of virtuous and industrious parents: it is the fact that both Prince Albert and the Queen allowed their children to become dependent on the public taxes for a living. No hard working man and woman in the country would obtain the respect of their neighbours if they allowed their children to become chargeable on the local taxes—in fact, such conduct would brand them with the name of paupers, and exclude them from political rights. Moreover, if they allowed their children to become dependent on local taxes at a time when they were possessed of immense incomes, they would be liable to prosecution, and they would richly deserve it. Of course, her Majesty, in her lofty position, is not expected to manifest the same virtues nor to comply with the same laws, as her subjects—the very titles convey a clear and distinct difference between a king and a

people. The one is kept by the many. There is an old proverb that many can aid one, while one cannot aid many—a very happy illustration of the case under consideration. The fact is that Parliament has granted by large majorities all the direct payments made to her Majesty and to the whole of her family, married and single; and hence, whatever blame may attach to the proceedings, the people's representatives are entitled to the greatest share of it.

The total sums voted by Parliament to the Queen and the rest of the Royal Family appear to be as follow—

Her Majesty the Queen	...	...	£17,325,000
The Princess Royal since	1857	...	184,000
The Prince of Wales „	1863	...	680,000
The Princess of Wales „	„	...	170,000
Prince Alfred ... „	1866	...	270,000
Prince Arthur ... „	1871	...	135,000
Princess Alice ... „	1861	..	108,000
Princess Helena „	1866	...	84,000
Princess Louise „	1871	...	54,000
Princess Mary ... „	1850	...	118,000
Prince Leopold ... „	1874	...	90,000
Princess Augusta „	1843	...	111,000
Duchess of Cambridge „	„	...	111,000
Duke of Cambridge „	1850	...	360,000
Total payments since	1837	...	£19,800,000

This sum represents the earnings of 5,000 mechanics at good wages over a period of 34 years—which happens to be the number of years during which payments have been made to some of the Royal family. Supposing the above sums had to be divided between 14 mechanics' families, according to their present incomes,

instead of among 14 Royal families, it would take the 14 mechanics, at their present rate of expenditure, about 13,000 years to expend it.

The details of the Royal incomes are given in a clear and concise manner in a pamphlet which has run through ten editions; but it must be observed that all its facts and dates relate to the state of things prior to 1871.

On the 23rd November, 1837, a Select Committee was appointed by the House of Commons to furnish an estimate of the probable expenses of the Royal Household. To ascertain these expenses the committee applied to the heads of the different departments, not for their average expenditure over a number of years, but for the sum that had been spent in the last twelve months of the late King's reign. But this year was hardly a fair example. For instance, the committee awarded £42,000 for the tradesmen's bills in the Lord Chamberlain's department, and yet in that year the King had payed an upholsterer's bill of £12,000, and it surely is preposterous to imagine that the Queen, during every year of her reign, would require to spend £12,000 in upholstery. It is equally impossible to suppose that this sum *has* thus been spent for the last 34 years

Again the committee set apart in the department of the Master of the Horse £3,000 a year for purchasing horses, and £4,800 for the purchase of carriages. Are

we then to believe that during the time the Queen has been upon the Throne £234,000 has been spent in carriages and horses?

The Royal Civil List, after having passed the committee and received the sanction of the House, stood as follows;—

Her Majesty's Privy Purse	£60,000
Household Salaries	131,260
Tradesmen's Bills	172.500
Royal Bounty and Alms	13,200
Unappropriated Money	8,040
	£385,000

Besides this the Queen has the power to grant pensions not exceeding in the aggregate £1,200 annually. On her marriage £30,000 per annum was granted to the Prince Consort, who also held a large number of sinecure offices of great emolument. In 1844 great reductions were made in the Royal Household, and these reductions, it is well understood, instead of returning to the hands of the nation, went to swell the Privy Purse. It is also equally well understood that savings which may be effected in any department, for instance in the £12,000 per annum for furniture, go to the Privy Purse; and who can doubt that under the economical management of the Prince Consort, which has been continued since his death, immense sums have been saved. In the estimates of last year there is an acknowledged surplus of £36,000 unaccounted for, which at once raises the Privy Purse to £96,000.

In some years the saving on the tradesmen's bills can be proved to have been *far* greater. The average for the last 20 years cannot be less than £50,000 per annum. It will be noticed, too, that a large sum is set aside for the Queen's Alms and Charities, so that when we see in the newspapers a Royal contribution to any particular fund we are not to imagine that it comes out of the Privy Purse, for she is bound by law thus to spend £13,200 every year. No income or property tax is paid on any part of the Royal Civil List. There is moreover an extra fund for keeping the Royal Palaces in repair. Early in the present reign £60,000 was spent upon the stables at Windsor, and at a later period the enormous sum of £300,000 was spent in building a new ball room at Buckingham Palace. £32,674 was voted for repairs last year, but it is fair to state that only £17,272 of this sum was for palaces in the occupation of Her Majesty. The net receipts of the Duchy of Lancaster, after paying every expense, amounted last year to £31,000; and there are many other sources of income to which it would be mere affectation on the part of the public to shut their eyes. As an instance we may mention the legacy left to the Queen of nearly one million sterling by an eccentric gentleman of the name of Nield. We must remember, too, that the Queen has large private estates both at Balmoral and Osborne; nor must it be forgotten that in the sum set apart for the salaries of the Household

there is an immense annual saving. In 1849 it was proved to be more than £30,000, and it is much greater at the present time. This sum also goes to the Privy Purse, and it is quite within the mark to say that the Queen has at her absolute disposal, after the payment of the Household expenses of the Royal Palaces, an income of £200,000 per annum.

I think, then, when we consider all these facts, that it is grossly misleading to represent the Queen as being merely in receipt of £60,000 per annum, and thus appeal to the compassion of the nation when one of her daughters is about to marry.

With respect to the amount and number of salaries paid to the officers of the household, I think I can show that they are as unnecessarily large as are the "tradesmen's bills."

The Lord Stewart (Earl Bessborough) receives £2,000 for purely nominal services; his deputy, the Treasurer of the Household (Lord de Tabley) receives £904; and the Comptroller of the Household (Lord Otho Fitzgerald) another £904, for equally imaginary duties. These appointments are nothing more or less than mere political sinecures.

The salary of the Master of the Household (Sir John Cowell) is £1,158. His duty is the "surveying" of the accounts which the Comptroller is supposed to have checked. But, lest this duty should be too arduous, he has under him two secretaries at £300 a

year each, several clerks with handsome salaries, and a Paymaster of the Household (Mr W. Hampshire) with a salary of £500. The Clerk of the Kitchen has £700 a year, with four clerks to assist him in his accounts. The actual kitchen staff consists of the Chief Cook £700, four master cooks at about half that sum, and eighteen salaried assistants. There are, too, in the confectionary department, a First Yeoman, with £300; Second Yeoman, £250; Pastry Cook, £250; and twelve assistants.

The Gentleman of the Wine Cellar receives £500, Principal Table Decker, £200; with assistants at £150, £90, and £52 respectively—but I should weary my readers to continue this list.

In the Chamberlain's Department their is first the Lord Chamberlain (Viscount Sydney) £2,000; the Vice-Chamberlain (Viscount Castleross) £904; Keeper of Her Majesty's Privy Purse, £2,000; Mistress of the Robes (Duchess of Sutherland), £500; Groom of the Robes, £800; eight Ladies of the Bedchamber, £4,000; eight Maids of Honour, £2,400; eight Bedchamber Women, £2,400; eight Lords in Waiting, £5,616; eight Grooms in Waiting, £2,685; and to finish this list about £12,500 to various Grooms, Ushers, and Pages. We must also bear in mind that every one of these officers has salaried assistants who do the real work. And then the bathos of finding at the bottom of this list—the Poet Laureate, Alfred

Tennyson, Esq., £100, exactly one-seventh of the Chief Cook's salary!!

The Master of the Horse (Marquis of Aylesbury) receives £2,500; the Chief Equerry (Lord Alfred Paget), £1,000; other Equerries and Pages, £4,280; the Master of the Buckhounds (Earl of Cork), £1,700; and then comes the last and greatest swindle of all—the Hereditary Grand Falconer (Duke of St. Alban's), £1,200!

The total number of salaried retainers in the three departments is 921. The vast majority of these offices are the most scandalous sinecures, and merely exist to furnish political berths for the extravagant scions of our aristocracy. One is reminded of the words of Shelley:—

> Those gilded flies,
> That bask within the sunshine of a Court,
> What are they? The drones of the community!
> They feed on the mechanic's labour;
> The starved hind, for them, compels the stubborn glebe
> To yield its unshared harvest.
> And yon squalid form, leaner than fleshless misery,
> Drags out his life in darkness in the unwholesome mine
> To glad their grandeur,
> Many faint with toil,
> That few may know the cares and woes of sloth."

ROYAL ANNUITIES.

The following is a list of the moneys annually paid to members of the Royal Family, in addition to the Civil List of £385,000:—

Prince of Wales	£40,000
Princess of Wales	10,000
Princess Royal	8,000
Prince Alfred	15,000
Prince Arthur	15,000
Princess Alice	6,000
Princess Helena	6,000
Princess Louise	6,000
Duke of Cambridge	12,000
Duchess of Cambridge	6,000
Princess Augusta	3,000
Princess of Teck	5,000
Total	£132,000

It has frequently been stated that Her Majesty has to give a considerable share of her own funds to the Prince of Wales. I would fain hope that this is not the case. In addition to the £50,000 mentioned above, he receives the moneys accruing from the Duchy of Cornwall. Last year he received from this source the net sum of £63,587. Moreover, during his minority, the accumulations on this estate had been so enormous that, on his coming of age, more than half a million sterling was invested for his future benefit. At the lowest computation this would give him a further income of £20,000 a year. The Prince of Wales, therefore, was in receipt last year of a positive income of £133,587. Surely, then, we may hope that he has not to apply to Her Majesty for a further sum.

We must bear in mind, too, that the Prince has one, if not more, sinecure post of great emolument in the Army, and that Marlborough House cost the country

£7,600 last year, which item is not included in the grant for Royal Palaces. The expenses also of the Yachts, of steaming across the channel when other vessels are used, of all the Royal gardens, and even the cost of presents made by the Princes when on their travels are all defrayed by the faithful Commons.

CROWN LANDS

As regards the Crown Lands, it is often asserted that as they were assigned by the Crown, and have now reached such a sum as to cover the Civil List, therefore the Crown costs the country nothing in that respect. In the first place, however, it is not accurate to assert that the receipts from those lands do cover the expenditure on the Civil List. Last year the net receipts from the Crown Lands were £360,123, leaving a deficit of £24,167, when set against the Civil List of £385,000.

It is only since these lands have been in the hands of the Commons that they have realized anything like the sum which they are now worth; when they were in the hands of the Crown they were so grossly mismanaged, and saddled with such a large number of pensioners, collectors, and receivers, that the bargain by which they were transferred to the country was in every way advantageous to the Crown. The Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the Woods, Forests, and

Land Revenues, under Act 26 Geo. III., c. 87, tells us that the estates of the Crown, for the first twenty-five years of the reign of George III., produced an average net revenue but little exceeding six thousand pounds a year!

It was owing to the improvidence, prodigality, and extravagance of our Kings, that they, little by little lost so many of their estates and heavily encumbered others, and it was their own necessities that at length placed them under the control of the Commons. When George III. became King he consented to leave the hereditary revenues of the Crown to be dealt with as Parliament thought best. This he did solely because of the great difficulties and debts in which his predecessor had been involved, for no other King ever contended so long and so bitterly for everything that he imagined to be a royal prerogative. He gave up all the Crown lands except the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster. The Civil List granted to him was £800,000, and other sources of revenue from Scotland and Ireland brought his income up to £1,000,000. The burdens, however, on these revenues were something enormous; they were eaten up by the huge household, and by demands made by his personal adherents. The money expended by himself and family was parsimoniously small. It ought not, also, to be forgotten that at this time a very large proportion of the judicial and diplomatic salaries was defrayed out of the Royal

Civil List. William IV. was content with a Civil List of £510,000, a large number of the charges, hitherto paid from that source, being remitted to the Consolidated Fund. On the accession of Victoria a still larger number of the salaries was similarly transferred, and the Civil List, as I have previously shown, was fixed at £385,000. (See *The Cost of the Royal Household*, by J. Charles Cox, 1871.)

The following is from an important speech made at the time this question was under discussion in the year 1871. "In the first place, let us consider what in this country Royalty may be supposed to cost; and, when we have done that, then let us turn to the arrangement which it is believed was made and by which we are said to be morally bound. We have first to deal with the sum of £372,000 a-year expended upon the Privy Purse and upon the Household, to which I add the Royal Bounty and Royal Alms, which amount to £13,000, making up the sum of £385,000. We next have £131,000 of annuities of a similar kind to that which we lately had to consider; the income of the Duchy of Lancaster, £32,000; that of Cornwall, £63,000; the interest on lump sums which have been paid to the various members of the Family still living, about £10,000—making up £621,000. Steam packets, insignia, presents (such as those given by Prince Alfred in India and Australia), pensions to Royal servants, rangerships of parks not borne upon the Civil List,

make £7,000 more; and military and naval pay to various members of the Family, about another £20,000. The palaces, omitting Hampton Court, which is a public show-place, are £47,000 more. I speak now only of the yearly charge on us, but sometimes sums which should by rights have come to the nation have been swallowed up in the palaces,—for instance, in 1849, £53,000 obtained by the sale of the Pavilion at Brighton was sunk in Buckingham Palace, as vast sums had previously been sunk by George IV. On Windsor Park their is a deficit in the Woods and Forests' account, and that deficit, of £12,000, about represents the cost of the keepers, game, and other royal as contrasted with public expenses in reference to the park. This makes £707,000, which is the end of the figures that are of a certain and very tangible character. Beyond this, we have two large sums, as to one of which we can be fairly accurate; as to the other of which we can give nothing but a guess. The first of them is the cost of the Guards. It would be totally unfair to set down anything like the whole cost of these regiments to the account of Royalty; because the infantry are good troops and are available as part of the regular army. I regret that it is not in my power to say so much for the cavalry of the Guards—the Life Guards and Horse Guards, as they are called. I do not speak of the stampede of their horses when the geese sounded the alarm at Chobham, but their

cumbersomeness and unsuitability to modern war were amply demonstrated in my presence on several occasions during the Hampshire campaign, and especially in the first battle, at Seale. I calculate that the cost of the Guards, over and above the cost of an equal number of the Line, including an increased expenditure caused by the expensive nature of the sites of two of their barracks, in the immediate neighbourhood of Royal palaces, would be about £100,000. I believe that it is not easy to overrate the evil effect upon any army of the existence of privileged corps. The first act of the French Republic, after the demoralized Empire was upset—no, not *the first*—the first was the abolition of the Senate, the French House of Lords—but *the second*, was the abolition of the privileges of the Imperial Guard, and its fusion with the regular army. At Sedan they had had painful experience of the value of *corps d'elite*, and things had come to such a pass that the troops used to hiss when the *cent garde* went by. Even the Royal Warrant on promotion in the army, issued last week, contains traces of the evil of which I speak. The Guards are excepted from the Warrant, and the Pages of Honour to the Queen are carefully allowed by special favour to enter the army without that examination to which less favoured mortals have to submit. You have been told that the army has been "bought back from the officers" at a cost of eight or ten millions: that purchase has been abolished: that it is

of vital importance that entrance to the army should be by open competition, and then you have at once an exception made in favour of these young gentlemen, which destroys the whole moral value of your rule. The other of the sums is, as I believe, the largest of all the separate items of expenditure connected with the Royal Family, and that is the cost of the Royal yachts. We all of us have heard the stories of the harm done to the naval service at the time of the Crimean war—both actual and incidental harm of a moral nature—by the diverting of the service of men who ought to have been employed upon our war ships, to the finishing for the Queen of one of the Royal yachts, the *Victoria and Albert*, I believe. But few of us are aware of the vast expenditure which still and at all times goes on upon Royal yachts—expenditure for building, for repairs, for coals, for seamen's wages, for pensions to the late officers and seamen of the yachts—an expenditure which at the least cannot be less than another £100,000 a-year, and which, having taken great pains to ascertain the facts, I believe very largely indeed to exceed that sum. Several able-bodied men I found employed all the year round at painting the ornamented fire buckets for these yachts. This makes the total figure £906,000, and I think that, speaking roughly, you may say that the positive and direct cost of Royalty is about a million a-year.

I need hardly say that all these enormous sums of money are not well spent, and it is almost worth a few

minutes' time to see in what kind of manner they do contrive to disappear. The salaries in the Royal Household, which amount to £131,000 a-year, include a vast number of totally useless officials—Chamberlains, Comptrollers, Masters of Ceremonies, Marshalls of the Household, Grooms of the Robes, Lords-in-Waiting, Grooms-in-Waiting, Gentlemen Ushers, and a few persons who appear to perform services, but who ought to be paid for those services as they perform them, and not be made permanent officials with great titles of honour, such, for instance, as the Historical Painter to the Queen, Portrait Painter to the Queen, and the Lithographer-in-Ordinary. Under the Lord Steward's department, and the department of the Master of the Horse, we have such officers as the Coroner of the Household, and the Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal, whose duties are not of a very burdensome description. Nothing is more singular than the constitution of the medical department. You would hardly credit the number of medical gentlemen who are required for the service of the Household, but I am aware that some of them are unpaid. There are three Physicians in Ordinary, three Physicians Extraordinary, one Sergeant-Surgeon Extraordinary, two Sergeant-Surgeons, three Surgeons Extraordinary, one Physician of the Household, one Surgeon of the Household, one Surgeon-Apothecary, two Chemists of the Establishment in Ordinary, one Surgeon-Oculist, one Surgeon-Dentist

one Dentist in Ordinary, and one other Physician—or 21 in all; while the Prince of Wales has for his special benefit three Honorary Physicians, two Physicians in Ordinary, two Surgeons in Ordinary, one Surgeon Extraordinary, one Chemist in Ordinary—or 11 more, making 32 doctors in the Family. I should be almost afraid of tiring anybody who listened to me when I went over the list of strange offices of which the Household is made up—Lord High Almoner, whose duties consist, I believe, in giving away, on certain mysterious days, silver twopenny pieces, made on purpose for him at the Mint; Sub-Almoner, Hereditary Grand Almoner, Master of the Buckhounds, Clerk of the Check, Clerk of the Closet, Exons in Waiting, and last, but not least, the Hereditary Grand Falconer—the Duke of St. Albans—who might perhaps with advantage, if he is to retain his salary of £1,200 a-year, be created Hereditary Grand Pigeon Shooter in Ordinary. If we turn to the Lord Steward's department, we come at once upon a mysterious Board of Green Cloth, as it is called, at the head of which are the Lord Steward, the Treasurer, the Comptroller of the Household, and the Master of the Household, with a perfect army of secretaries and clerks, and with special secretaries, with special offices, and with special salaries, in each of those sections of the department. In the kitchen department, we have a Chief Cook and four Master Cooks, receiving salaries of between £2,000 and £3,000 a-year between the five;

and a host of confederates some of whom have duties that I cannot even guess at—such, for instance, as the two "Green Office" men. There are whole departments the duties of which cannot be very considerable, one would think, or, at all events, not considerable enough to warrant their being made into departments of the Household—for instance, the confectionery department and the ewer department, while the duty of table decking employs no less than five persons, who have salaries of between £500 and £600 a-year in all. Now, I have said already that a great deal of this expenditure brings no benefit in any shape to members of the Royal Family, and that it is largely an expenditure upon mere sinecures, but at the same time the expenditure could be curtailed. No one can doubt but that the Queen might abolish these offices if she chose, and that if, as I believe, she has no right to abolish them and take over the consequent savings to her own use, Parliamentary powers for the abolition of the offices—taking the saving to the public—would gladly be given to the Treasury and the Crown. Indeed there can be no doubt, as it seems to me, but that it is the duty of those who are the responsible Ministers of the Crown to advise the Queen to abolish them; because many of the chief offices in the Household are notoriously made use of for political purposes, and those members of the Household who have seats in the House of Commons, are expected to vote against independent members, just

as steadily as though they were political members of the Government. The bad tone, moreover, that is set by the retention of these ridiculous sinecures extends far beyond the limits of the Household, and does much towards continuing the political demoralization in high places which all of us deplore.

The Prince of Wales when he came of age received, it is said, £750,000, the accumulations of his income during his minority; and the Queen received on one occasion a legacy of two-thirds of that amount—sums which together ought of themselves alone to produce an additional income of £50,000 a-year. Besides the Crown lands which they do not enjoy, the Royal Family are owners of private lands, which are in fact that which the Crown lands are said to be, but in fact are not—namely the private property of the Queen, in the sense in which Belvoir Castle is the property of the Duke of Rutland.

The Crown lands, if ever they were private property at all, have been confiscated ten times over. If they were not confiscated at the great Rebellion and only conditionally restored at the Restoration, they were thoroughly confiscated at the time of the flight of James II. Hallam, in writing of the first Parliament of Charles II., says that, 'they provided various resources,' of which one branch was the Crown Lands, which he classes with the ordinary revenues, such as Customs and Excise. The fact is, that no one who

has examined the tenure of these lands can possibly come to any conclusion except that they are lands wholly within the authority and control of Parliament. If they are private lands of the Crown, and there is a contract lasting only for the reign; if at the end of this reign they are to be given over to the Prince of Wales, then I want to know why these annuities we are granting now are to be made perpetual. If all is true that is said by the Court about these singular arrangements, then I say that these annuities should be granted only up to a demise of the Crown and no further. The Committee of the House of Commons which sat to settle the amount of the Civil List at the beginning of the reign never took into account the revenues of the Crown Lands, and, indeed, never seem to have heard of the doctrine with respect to those lands which has lately been laid down by Liberal Ministers. As is shown by the pamphlet to which I refer, and shown, I know, with accuracy, the Committee considered only the actual past expenditure of former Kings, and the probable future expenditure of the present Queen. So much is a matter of fact, and capable of proof. The House of Commons went further than to fix the amount as a whole. It divided it under the various heads, and fixed the amount in each division; and so careful was the House of Commons as to put these divisions into the schedule of the Act. A clause in the Act lays it down that the

saving in any one class cannot be carried to any other, and the powers given to the Lords of the Treasury to apply savings at the end of the year clearly contemplate only trifling variations in the expenditure from year to year, its general character for the reign having been immutably fixed by the House of Commons at the beginning of the reign itself. This, again, is a matter of fact, and capable of proof. The £172,000 and odd a-year, for instance, that used to be spent on tradesmen's bills when the Court kept up great splendour—how much of that is spent now, when there is no Court at all? Where does the £100,000 a-year, or whatever may be the amount, saved under this head—where does that go to? Speaking for myself, I think that it was intended that the money allotted by the House of Commons to the Crown should be spent, and that it should not accumulate to form a private fortune for Queen Victoria as an individual.

I think there is the strongest probability, almost amounting to a certainty, that large accumulations have taken place, and that, if so, those accumulations, made by the connivance of the Treasury, are directly in the teeth of the Act of Parliament.

It is impossible to discuss this subject without referring to Mr. Disraeli's speech to the inhabitants of a village near his house, made not long ago in proposing the Queen's health. Speaking of the duties o

the holder of the Crown, he said that an erroneous impression was prevalent with respect to them. He said that they were 'multifarious,' that they were 'weighty,' and that they were 'unceasing.' Now, we knew that they were 'multifarious,' and that they were 'unceasing,' but very few people had any idea that they were 'weighty.' Weighty means more than laborious. Mr. Disraeli went on the next moment to call them 'laborious,' and he never uses two words which mean the same thing. He explained what he meant by 'weighty,' and these were his most serious words: 'There is not a despatch received from abroad nor one sent from this country which is not submitted to the Queen. The whole internal administration of this country greatly depends upon the sign-manual; and of our present Sovereign it may be said that her signature has never been placed to any public document of which she did not know the purport, and of which she did not approve.' Now, I call these most serious words, and I think if you consider them you will say that they are such. They divide themselves into two parts—Foreign and Home—and the statement is much stronger with regard to Home affairs than with regard to Foreign. No despatch received or sent that is not submitted to the Queen. Well, it may be, of course, that this word 'submitted' means only here that the Queen is made aware of that which is spoken to the Foreign Minister by Foreign Powers,

or by him to them. It may mean this, or it may mean more; but the statement with regard to Home affairs is so much stronger that I prefer to dwell on that. I will repeat the words:—'The whole internal administration of the country greatly depends upon the sign-manual, and of our present Sovereign it may be said that her signature has never been placed to any public document of which she does not approve.' Now, what does this mean, if it is true, but personal government? I cannot believe that it is true. I do not believe it as a fact. But here is Mr. Disraeli—a man no doubt of fine imagination, and who may perhaps unconsciously colour things in stating them—here is Mr. Disraeli saying that nothing in this country can be done without the Queen's sign-manual, and that the Queen signs nothing she does not approve. What does the Emperor of Russia do more than that? What occurs if the Queen does not approve? You would answer that, the country being under a Constitutional Monarchy, the Minister resigns, and that the Queen is forced by the Constitution to find a a Minister who agrees with her before she can carry out her views; that if the late Minister was backed up by the country she would be unable to do this, and that, therefore, no harm can be done. No doubt this is very true of all great matters, but how about small? When have we ever heard in modern times of a Minister resigning because of the expression by

the 'Sovereign,' to use Mr. Disraeli's favourite word, of a will adverse to his opinion? Never. Yet he tells us that the Queen never signs anything that she does not approve, and that nothing can be done without her signature. Does, then, the Minister give way when she does not approve? and are things left undone that would otherwise have been done, and things altered that are done, because of the personal will of the monarch? Or, are we to accept the opposite alternative, that, whatever Minister is in office—Conservative, Whig, or Radical—the Queen's political conscience is of such a nature as to admit of her fully approving of everything that he does? For the life of me, I cannot conceive what Mr. Disraeli means. If we adopt the latter alternative, it is one little flattering to the intelligence of the Sovereign whose character Mr. Disraeli has described; and, if we adopt the former, it affords us a view of Constitutional Monarchy in which it is impossible to distinguish it from the autocracy that all of us condemn.

Let us consider, again, how greatly Mr. Disraeli's theory of our administrative system, if we are to accept it as a correct one, increases that waste of time and labour which arises from the circumstance that her Majesty, neglecting the Palaces which are maintained for her at the public cost, prefers to dwell at her private residences—Osborne and Balmoral. At one or other of these distant places a member of the

Government has to be constantly in attendance, and thither every despatch, however pressing, must be sent.

To return for a moment to the considerations of cost with which I began this speech; I have shown that it is enormous, and that the expenditure is chiefly not waste but mischief. What are the two departments, for instance, over which we have not as yet succeeded in establishing a sound parliamentary control? The army for one, and the woods and forests for another. In both of these cases the influence at work which has hitherto proved too strong for the House of Commons is that of the Court. In the latter instance, we stand still with folded hands before the profligate waste at Windsor; and speechless in the face of the Minister's declaration of adherence to opinions which were obsolete in the times of the Stuarts. In the former—that of the army—we have a Royal Duke, not necessarily the fittest man, at the head of it by right of birth, and the Prince of Wales, who would never be allowed a command in time of war, put to lead the cavalry division in the autumn manœuvres, thus robbing working officers of the position and of the training which they had a title to expect.

There is a wide-spread belief that a Republic here is only a matter of education and of time. It is said that some day a Commonwealth will be our Govern-

ment. Now, history and experience show that you cannot have a Republic without you possess at the same time Republican virtues; but you answer, Have we not public spirit? have we not the practice of self-government? are not we gaining general education? Well, if you can show me a fair chance that a Republic here will be free from the political corruption that hangs about a Monarchy, I say, for my part—and I believe that the middle classes in general will say—let it come."—(*"The Cost of the Crown," by Sir Charles Dilke*, speech at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Nov., 1871.)

In concluding this chapter, we quote the following:

"A Parliamentary return, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons on the 26th July, 1869, contains the only accessible official information as to the origin of the Civil List. On the 19th of March, 1872, Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons treated the subject at great length in a vain endeavour to obtain Parliamentary investigation or more complete official returns.

The Civil List, which is now understood to mean the annual sum granted by Parliament for the support of the Royal Household, formerly meant much more. The first Civil List Act passed by Parliament was the 9 and 10 William III., cap. 23, by which £700,000 per annum was voted. This included—as the accounts for the year 1700 show—all the expenses of the

nation except interest, management, and repayment of National Debt, army, navy, and ordance. The following are the approximate items of the cost of the Royal Family per annum :—

Her Majesty the Queen, £385,000. Income of the Duchy of Lancaster, £42,000 ; including a compensation annuity from the Consolidated Fund, the total income of the Duchy is about £69,000. As Duchess of Lancaster, Her Majesty receives £101 every year from the nation as an ancient fee. Cost of Royal palaces inhabited, or partly inhabited, by Her Majesty, or inhabited without Parliamentary authority by pensioned members of the Royal Family, £35,680. Cost of Royal yachts paid by the country, amount not at present ascertainable. The *aides de camp* to the Queen are charged separately in the army estimates.

Her Majesty's enormous private property in foreign funds and landed estate is not included here, although the whole of this property must have been obtained by her from moneys economised out of the national allowance to herself and to Prince Albert, as the Duke of Kent, her father, died hopelessly insolvent, and the Prince Albert had practically no estate when he married.

There is a further sum of £1,500 voted annually to Her Majesty to enable her to be charitable in Scotland, and a smaller sum of £300 to enable her to be charitable in Ireland, and there have also been yearly

votes of about £1,500 for racing plates to be given in Her Majesty's name. In Scotland the vote for Queen's plates comes to £218.

There is no real foundation for the allegation that the Duchy of Lancaster is the private property of the Queen. In the reign of Anne, the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster were not only part of the Civil List, but the Crown was restrained from making grants except under the provisions of 1 Anne, c. 7. So far as I am aware, although a recital was introduced into an Act of George III. that the King is possessed of himself, his heirs, and successors, of the possessions of the Duchy, it was not until 1830 that any claim of purely private property was set up. On December 1, 1830, William IV., in a letter written to Earl Grey, claimed the Duchy 'as his separate, personal and private estate, vested in his Majesty by descent from Henry VII. in his body natural, and *not in his body politic as king.*' This claim is monstrously absurd, as William IV. in his body natural was most certainly not the heir male of Henry VII., even if the Duchy had passed by natural succession.

The Princess Royal has an annuity of £8,000. Her Royal Highness is Crown Princess of Prussia, and received a grant of £40,000 on her marriage.

Prince of Wales and Princess of Wales, £50,000. The Prince of Wales owns 86,680 acres of land in eight counties.

Net income of Duchy of Cornwall, about £70,000. The total income of the Duchy in 1875 was £101,828.

The Duchy of Cornwall is the result of a charter of Edward III., stated to be confirmed by a statute of 11 Edward III., which statute is not in the revised statutes. The Duchy of Cornwall is not and cannot be the private property of the present Prince of Wales, who can only have a life estate in it, yet parts of the Duchy have been sold, but no return has, so far as I am aware, been made of the capital moneys received, or of their disposition, though in some years the receipts from such sales have been many thousands of pounds. There were formerly three pensions—one of £3,000 a year to the Earl of Bath, another of £2,000 a year to Lord D'Auverquerque, and a third of £300 to Sir Peter Killigrew, all payable out of the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall. These pensions have all been transferred to the cost of the nation, thus increasing the net income of the Duchy of Cornwall. Interest on £602,720 Duchy of Cornwall accumulations in 1861, say £18,000 per annum. Sir Charles Dilke, in Parliament, stated these accumulations without contradiction at £743,000. Landed property rents, say, yearly, £8,000. Military income not included. There is no record of the property inherited by the Prince of Wales from his father, nor can any information be given, as the will is illegally kept secret. Occasional sums are voted for

the repairs of his Royal Highness's residence. In one year £8,000 was paid for this. In 1876, £550 was charged. In 1878, £6,458 is the figure of expenditure. In 1877 it was £4,100. In 1879 it was £2,975. In 1880 it was £2,420.

There is an item each year in the national accounts of £16,216 paid to the Receiver-General of the Duchy of Cornwall for loss of duties on the coinage of tin. This item is, in fact, an annuity paid by the nation to the Prince of Wales. Although then enormously rich, His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, was content to receive from the people on the occasion of his coming of age, a parliamentary grant of £23,455.

£142,000 was voted for the Prince's Indian journey. There was some talk that this £142,000 would not be sufficient, and in 1875 a huge petition was presented to the House of Commons against any further grant. Mr. Disraeli said that no further grant would be required, as the whole amount had not been expended, but a balance had been left in hand. Despite this statement on the part of Mr. Disraeli, additional sums have for two years past been smuggled into the Navy Estimates on account of this journey of the Prince of Wales to India.

The Duke of Edinburgh £25,000. The naval income is not included in this annuity, nor is any account taken of the value of the hereditary rights to the Dukedom of Saxe-Coburg, and which are variously

estimated. The Duke of Edinburgh has now a large additional income from his wife.

Prince Arthur, £25,000. No estimate is here made of the yearly value of the premises belonging to the nation occupied without any Parliamentary authority, by the Prince, and for which he pays no rent.

Prince Leopold, £15,000.

Princess Helena, £6,000, and a grant of £30,000 on her marriage to Prince Christian of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg.

Princess Louise, £6,000, and a grant on her marriage to the Marquis of Lorne.

Princess Augusta, Duchess of Cambridge, £6,000 (the Financial Reform Almanack for 1878 gives this at £3,000 only). In addition we spend a large sum of money to repair Her Royal Highness's apartments in St. James's Palace, and we pay the rent of her stables in Brick Street, Piccadilly.

Princess Mary of Cambridge, £5,000 (married to the Duke of Teck). The White Lodge, Richmond Park, is occupied by the Duke and Duchess of Teck, and no sort of rent or compensation is paid by them to the nation, nor is there any parliamentary authority for the occupation,

Princess Augusta of Mecklenburgh-Strelitz, £3,000.

Prince George, Duke of Cambridge, £12,000.

This does not include His Royal Highness's salary as Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, and Colonel,

nor does it include any benefits derived by the Duke of Cambridge from any rangerships or other posts held by him. A large proportion of Richmond Park is enclosed as game preserve for His Royal Highness. As far as can be ascertained, the military salaries of the Duke of Cambridge are, as Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, £4,432; as Colonel of the Grenadier Guards, £2,200. It is extremely difficult from the military estimates to say if these are given accurately.

Some persons pretend that the amounts paid to the Royal Family are justly due to them as part compensation for valuable properties surrendered by them to the nation. The only property belonging to the Brunswicks when they came to England was their Hanoverian property; this they not only kept, but actually added to out of English taxpayers' pockets. They surrendered nothing. When James II. was declared to have forfeited the Crown, and his heir male was disinherited, it is clear that the nation, or Parliament on its behalf, gave a distinct schedule of revenues for the Royal maintenance, first to William of Orange, and then to Queen Anne and the children of the Electress Sophia, but there was no sort of private inheritance for the new-comers to surrender in return. They, at that time, were not even the heirs to the private estate of James II., if he had left any private estate in this country.

In the early stages of the Civil List the grants to members of the Royal Family were made by the

Monarch for the life of the Monarch. In 1737, Frederick, Prince of Wales, applied to Parliament for a larger allowance than had been made to him by George II., and the King then objected that Parliament had nothing whatever to do with the maintenance of the Royal Family.

In order to find out the cost of the Royal Family, it is needful to examine the whole of the financial accounts with the most careful scrutiny. In the Naval expenditure for 1877, £1,262 4s. 0d. was charged for conveyance of Her Majesty and the Royal Household. It was stated in the House of Commons that the amount voted for the journey of the Prince of Wales to India was more than sufficient, and that a small surplus had been left undisbursed. Despite this there is, on page 210 of the Naval Estimates, the following item:—Expenses incurred in connection with the visit of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales to India, £4,360 14s. 8d. Lumped in an item of £3,386 8s. 7d., so that it is impossible to fix the exact amount, I find: 'Pay of Equerry to the Duke of Edinburgh' and 'allowance to messes of Her Majesty's ship *Sultan*, while H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh was in command;' and in 1880, £11,000 was devoted for 'Conveyance by Sea of the Royal Household, entertainment of Royal personages, and other small or unforseen expenses.'"—(*The Impeachment of the House of Brunswick, by Charles Bradlaugh.*)

CHAPTER VII.

The American Republic.

"In the year 1800 the population of America was five millions 308 thousands; in 1880 it reached 59,152,559. As everyone knows the population is made up of peoples of all nations. In 1870 the Democratic law was perfected; it was enacted that '*no discrimination should be made* as regards the franchise or holding office in any State on account of *colour*, *race*, *nativity*, *property*, *education*, or *creed*.'

The legislature in every case consists of two bodies. The House of Representatives is chosen for one or two years, the Senate varying from two to six years. All are chosen by popular election, except the Federal Senate, which is elected by the legislatures.

The President and Vice-President are elected every four years. The President must be a natural born citizen of America, and fourteen years a resident within the States, and must have attained the age of 35 years. He is commander of all the military forces, and can veto all laws; but two-thirds of both Houses

can make any Bill so vetoed become the law of the land. In case of resignation or death the Vice-President fills the office to the end of the President's term of office, his own being temporally filled up by the Senate. The President's salary is £10,000 a-year, and the Vice-President's £2,000 a-year. Both these officers are elected by all the States on Tuesday following the 1st Monday in November in every fourth year, and the President takes office on the 4th of March following. He chooses seven chief officers as heads of departments to conduct the administrative business of the country, but they must have the approval of the Senate, and each has a salary of £1,600 a-year.

The House of Representatives consists of 292 members, who must be 25 years of age, seven years residents of the States, and must reside in the States they represent. There is also a 'delegate' for every organised territory who has the right to speak, but not to vote; both are elected in the same way—that is, by all the male citizens over 21 years of age.

The Senate is composed of two members for each State, and are elected by the legislatures of each State for six years. They must be not less than 30 years of age, residents nine years, and reside in the State for which they are chosen. Both Houses by a vote of two-thirds may expel any member, and the same number have power to amend the Constitution, and

to which they have added since 1787 fifteen amendments.

Each senator, representative, and delegate is paid £1,000 a-year, and travelling expenses by the nearest route once each way during every Session. Every member is bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution, but 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the United States'

The President and the Governors may be impeached and removed for treason, bribery, or crime of any other kind.

Education is general in all the States, but owing to the existence of slavery and the ignorant populations imported the census of 1870 revealed the fact that there were between four and five millions over 10 years of age without any elementery knowledge. Still, at the same time, there were over seven millions of children attending school at the expense of over 95 millions of dollars.

The total national expenditure in the year 1879 was $257,334,252 The surplus of revenue every year is applied to the redemption of the National Debt, which in 1878 was £460,243,397; in 1862 it was £102,842,274. The greatest cost is the interest on the war debt; the cost of the administration, the executive, legislature, etc., included under the Civil List, is only about one-fourth, viz., $53,034,185, the debt costing

$97,000,000. The taxes of the whole country before the war were, in 1850, £16,600,000; in 1860, £30,800,000, while in 1870 they amounted to £146,000,000. All the debts of all the States in 1870 were £70,000,000.

In 1870 the population was 38,558,371. The total area reported in 1870 was 3,603,884 square miles, of which 189 millions of acres (1-10th) are under cultivation. In 1870 there were 37 States and 10 territories, and two territories have been added since.

The immigrants from Great Britain to the United States during 50 years, including 1870, were nearly four millions, and the total from all countries swelled the number up to 7,553,865. Of these millions, during these years, Ireland contributed 2,700,493, and Germany 2,267,500.

"The characteristic facts in the Constitution of America are the non-existence of titles, of privileged classes, of Corporations in our sense of the term, of landed aristocracy, of mendicity, except to a very limited extent, and of an endowed Church; the cheapness and efficiency of its Government, the universality of education, the omnipresence of its periodical Press, the high feeling of self-respect which exists in the very humblest class, and the boundless spirit of enterprise which pervades all classes of the community The higher classes are less polished than in England, the middle are perhaps less carefully

instructed; but the American people taken collectively are at least as well educated, and have as much intelligence and manliness of character as any other nation in the world."—(*Ency. Brit.*, 1880. Art: America.)

"There is one peculiar feature in several States; the judges are elected by the people, and only for short terms, instead of, as in England, appointed by the Ministry, and only removable by both Houses of Parliament. Another peculiarity is that the Supreme Court of the Union can veto any law over the heads of the President and both Houses of Parliament, if it deems the law unconstitutional; that is, the Court declares any law void which does not harmonise with the Constitution. The Supreme Court is, therefore, properly speaking, the guardian of the American Constitution.

The American Government appears to embody the principal elements which the most advanced reformers consider essential to a perfect State. Firstly, that the origin of a Government should be in every nation the intelligence of that nation in whatever class it resides. Absolute equality of social and State rights admits of such intelligence being manifested. Secondly, that every parish, township, county, or province, should be allowed self-control, to govern itself, leaving the Imperial Parliament to look after the Imperial concerns of all. As regards America itself, it may be useful to give some general description to

that the reader may realise the vastness of the area over which the Republic reigns.

The Republic owns within her two ocean frontiers more than three million square miles of land; a fourth part of a million square miles of water, either salt or fresh; a range of Alps, a range of Pyrenees, a range of Apennines; forests by the side of which the Schwarzwald and the Ardennes would be German toys; rivers exceeding the Danube and the Rhine, as much as those rivers exceed the Mersey and the Clyde. . . . Yes, the Republic is a big country. The State of Oregon is bigger than England; California is about the size of Spain; Texas would be larger than France if France won the frontier of the German Rhine.

If the United States were parted into equal lots, they would make fifty-two kingdoms as large as England, fourteen empires as large as France. Even the grander figure of Europe, the seat of our great powers, and of many lesser powers,—a continent which we used to call the world, and fight to maintain in delicate balance of parts,—fails us when we come to measure in its lines such amplitudes as those of the United States. . . Leaving out of view all rivers, all lakes, there remain in the United States about one thousand nine hundred and twenty-six million acres, nearly all of them productive land; forest, prairie, down, alluvial bottom; all lying in the

temperate zone; healthy in climate, rich in wood, in coal, in oil, in iron; a landed estate that would give to each head of five million families a lot of three hundred and eighty-five acres; . . white men, black men, red men, yellow men; they are citizens of this country, paying its taxes, feeding on its produce, obeying its laws."—(*New America, by W. H. Dixon.* pp. 21, 24.)

"The One, the Few, the Many, and the All. Freedom and order. The universal People's Will, and the universal Will of God. How to reconcile liberty with necessity, or orderly development with destiny—which represents the final consummation? The one and the all are, as ruling powers, the only fixed quantities. The few and the many, are either instalments and compromises, or quackeries, delusions and names. The theory of Democracy is catholic and unassailable. The practice exists only in the United States of America. The possible failure, therefore, of Democracy *there* would only subject the world to new cycles of revolutions, and to other cycles of vicissitudes, of which the only certain things would be the torment and desolation of the process, and the ultimate triumphs of the principle."—(*J. A. Partridge on Democracy*, p. 184.)

"America is the land of the future where, in the ages that lie before us, the burden of the world's history shall reveal itself. It is the land of desire for

all those who are weary of the historical lumber-room of old Europe. It is for America to abandon the ground on which hitherto the history of the world has developed itself."—(*Hegel, Philosophy of History.*)

"It is therefore probable that mankind would have been at length obliged to live constantly under the government of a single person had they not conceived a kind of Constitution that has all the internal advantages of a Republican, together with the external force of a Monarchical, Government. I mean a confederated Republic. This form of Government is a convention by which several petty states agree to become members of a larger one which they intend to establish. It is a kind of assemblage of societies, that constitute a new one, capable of increasing by further associations, till they are at such a degree of power as to be able to provide for the security of the whole body. It was these associations that so long contributed to the prosperity of Greece. By these the Romans attacked the whole globe: and by these alone the whole globe withstood them. A Republic of this kind, able to withstand an external force, may support itself without any internal corruption."—(*Montesquieu.* Vol. 1. p. 65.)

"We are draining—we shall drain from the old world its most precious, its most important possessions,—its intelligent labouring classes. Thus emigration will change our relation to the European

nations. Men and money make a nation powerful. Our true policy is peace."—(*North American Review.*)

"Now my idea of American civilisation is that it is a second part, a reflection of that sublime confidence in the public conscience and the public thought that made the groundwork of Grecian Democracy. Not only the inevitable, but the best power this side of the ocean, is the unfettered common sense of the masses. We are launched on the ocean of an unchained Democracy, with no safety but in those laws that bind the ocean to its bed,—the instinctive love of right in the popular heart."—(*Wendell Phillips.*)

"Every American is in some sense a patriot and a person of cultivated intelligence. No such wide diffusion of the ideas, tastes, and sentiments of educated minds, has ever been seen elsewhere, or even conceived of as attainable."—(*J. S. Mill.*)

"There is unquestionably some advantage in a country like America where no apprehension need be entertained of a *coup d'etat* in making the chief Minister constitutionally independent of the legislative body, and rendering the two great branches of the Government, while equally popular both in their origin and in their responsibility, an effective check on the other. The plan is in accordance with the sedulous avoidance of the concentration of the great masses of power in the same hands, which is a marked characteristic of the American Federal Constitution."—(*J. S. Mill, Representative Government*, p. 250.)

"America has left behind it, in its passage over the ocean, the elements of the feudal system, hereditary aristocracy, primogeniture, entails, and the Established Church. Their fundamental institutions—the principle of social and political equality, the absence of hereditary rank, of primogeniture and entails, their free churches and common schools, are essentially of the new and not those of the old world."—(*Goldwin Smith.*)

"There is nothing in the world so sound as American Society, with its intimate union of all classes, its general diffusion of property, its common schools, and its free religion. The danger of Communism, or of anything like a war of classes, is never felt.

The local institutions also are perfectly healthy and form in themselves, and by their effect in training the political character of the people, the sheet anchor of the Constitution.

The manhood of the nation would bring with it, no doubt, many new difficulties, but the past will never return. Feudalism, primogeniture, and State Churches were left behind for ever.

That the victory has been won, not by a man but by the nation, is your glory, and the pledge of your salvation. The Cromwell of this age is an intelligent, resolute, and united people."—(*Goldwin Smith.*)

"The American war was the earliest, and for several years it most entirely absorbed the attention of English politicians in the reign of George II. A proposal had

been made to increase the revenue by taxing the colonists; which, as the Americans were totally unrepresented in Parliament, was simply a proposition to tax an entire people without even the form of asking their consent. This scheme of public robbery was rejected by that able and moderate man who was then at the head of affairs, and the suggestion being generally deemed impracticable fell to the ground, and seems, indeed, hardly to have excited attention. But what was deemed by the Government of George II. to be a dangerous stretch of arbitrary power was eagerly welcomed by the Government of George III. For the new king having the most exalted notion of his own authority, and being from his miserable education entirely ignorant of public affairs, thought that to tax the Americans for the benefit of the English would be a masterpiece of policy. When, therefore, the old idea was revived, it met with his cordial acquiescence, and when the Americans showed their intention of resisting this monstrous injustice he was only more confirmed in his opinion that it was necessary to curb their unruly will. Nor need we be surprised at the rapidity with which such angry feelings broke out. Indeed, looking on the one hand at the despotic principles which, for the first time since the Revolution were now revived at the English Court; and looking on the other hand at the independent spirit of the Colonists it was impossible to avoid a struggle between

the two parties, and the only questions were as to what form the contest would take, and towards which side victory was most likely to incline. On the part of the English Government no time was lost. Five years after the accession of George III. a Bill was brought into Parliament to tax the Americans, and so complete had been the change in political affairs that not the least difficulty was found in passing a measure which in the reign of George II. no Minister had dared to propose. Formerly such a proposal, if made, would certainly have been rejected; now the most powerful parties in the State were united in its favour. The king on every occasion paid court to the clergy, to which since the death of Anne they had been unaccustomed; he was therefore sure of their support, and they zealously aided him in every attempt to oppress the Colonies. The aristocracy, a few leading Whigs excepted, were on the same side, and looked to the taxation of America as a means of lessening their own contributions. As to George III., his feelings on the subject were notorious, and the more liberal party not having yet recovered from the loss of power consequent on the death of George II., there was little fear of difficulties from the Cabinet, it being well known that the Throne was occupied by a prince whose first object was to keep Ministers in strict dependence on himself, and who whenever it was practicable called into office such weak and flexible

men as would yield unhesitating submission to his wishes. Everything being thus prepared, there followed those events which were to be expected from such a combination.

Without stopping to relate details which are known to every reader, it may be briefly mentioned that in this new state of things the wise and forbearing policy of the preceding reign was set at naught, and the national councils guided by rash and ignorant men, who soon brought the greatest disasters upon the country, and within a few years actually dismembered the Empire in order to enforce the monstrous claim of taxing the whole people without their consent. There was waged against America a war ill-conducted, unsuccessful, and, what is far worse, accompanied by cruelties disgraceful to a civilised nation. To this may be added that an immense trade was nearly annihilated; every branch of commerce was thrown into confusion; we were disgraced in the eyes of Europe; we incurred an expense of £140,000,000; and we lost by far the most valuable colonies any nation had ever possessed. Such were the first fruits of the policy of George III. But the mischief did not stop there. The opinions which it was necessary to advocate, the order to justify this barbarous war, recoiled upon ourselves. In order to defend the attempt to destroy the liberties of America principles were laid down which if carried into effect would have

subverted the liberties of England, not only in the Court, but in both Houses of Parliament. From the episcopal bench and from the pulpit of the Church party there were promulgated doctrines of the most dangerous kind—doctrines unsuited to a limited Monarchy, and indeed incompatible with it. The extent to which this reaction proceeded is known to very few readers, because the evidence of it is chiefly to be found in the Parliamentary debates and in the theological literature, particularly the sermons of that time, none of which are now much studied. But not to anticipate matters belonging another part of this work, it is enough to say that the danger was so imminent as to make the ablest defenders of popular liberty believe that everything was at stake, and that if the Americans were vanquished the next step would be to attack the liberties of England, and endeavour to extend to the mother country the same arbitrary Government which by that time would have been established in the colonies. Whether or not these fears were exaggerated is a question of considerable difficulty; but after a careful study of that time, and a study too from sources not much used by historians, I feel certain that they who are best acquainted with the period will be most willing to admit that though the danger may have been over-rated, it was far more serious than men are now inclined to believe. At all events, it is certain that the general aspect of political

affairs was calculated to excite great alarm. It is certain that during many years the authority of the Crown continued to increase until it reached a height of which no example had been seen in England for several generations. It is certain that the Church of England exerted all her influence in favour of those despotic principles which the king wished to enforce. It is also certain that by the constant creation of new peers all holding the same views, the character of the House of Lords was undergoing a slow but decisive change, and that whenever a favourable opportunity arose high judicial appointments and high ecclesiastical appointments were conferred upon men notorious for their leaning towards the Royal prerogative. These are facts which cannot be denied; and, putting them together, there remains, I think, no doubt that the American War was a great crisis in the history of England, and that if the Colonists had been defeated our liberties would have been for a a time in considerable jeopardy. From that risk we were saved by the Americans, who with heroic spirit resisted the Royal armies, defeated them at every point, and at length, separating themselves from the mother-country, began that wonderful career which in less than eighty years has raised them to unexampled prosperity."—(*H. T. Buckle, Hist. Civ.* Vol i., pp. 434-439. London, 1858.)

"A retrospective glance at the chief incidents of that great event must be at all times interesting,

especially to Englishmen, the present generation of whom may possibly be called upon to meet and decide a question akin to that of which the barbarous and sanguinary solution cost their country, between 70 and 80 years ago, so terrible a sacrifice of blood and treasure. The question of colonial connection and independence is fortunately no longer exclusively viewed through the blinding mists of a vainglorious and spurious patriotism. Experience has effectually disposed of some of the grosser fallacies proclaimed in those days by the wisdom of our ancestors. It would scarcely be possible now, one would hope, to call down the applauding shouts of the Commons by Lord North's declaration, so loudly cheered in 1775—'that absolute sovereignty over our colonies is a question virtually interwoven with not the increase, but the maintenance, of commerce with them.' Neither, we imagine, are there many persons in this age and country, however nervous and impressionable, that would feel greatly alarmed at the repetition, by any tongue, however sonorous and eloquent, of the Earl of Chatham's oracular counsel to his admiring peers—'When the power of this country ceases to be sovereign and supreme over America, I would advise every gentleman to sell his lands, and embark for that country.' As we have unquestionably outgrown such puerilities as these, we may reasonably hope that others of less transparent, but not less real, absurdity

will in time pass away from the national mind; and that, warned by the errors of the blundering past, a more honourable, a more rational determination of the vexed question of colonial dependence and imperial dominion may in future be arrived at; and that, should the necessity arise, the last grasp of the hand exchanged by this country with any of its giant children, in token of merely political separation, will be a pledge of goodwill and hearty sympathy—the precursor and sign of a true and real alliance of interests, purposes, affections, cemented by community of origin, of language, of literature, and of religion.

The separation of England and the United States is now felt to have been one, sooner or later, of necessity. No one in the present day pretends that the restless, enterprising millions of North America could be safely or satisfactorily governed by any amount of wisdom which might happen to be enthroned in Downing Street; and assuredly no sane Englishman can regret the rapid growth in numbers and resources of a kindred people, who exchange, and, we venture to say, will continue to exchange, the rich surplus of their varied climate and fertile soil for the products of the skilled industry of Great Britain: nor is it caused by any emotion of wounded national pride or vanity; for if he have made himself master of the subject, he knows that at no period have the military qualities which distinguish the British race been more

conspicuously and brilliantly displayed than throughout that disastrous conflict. His regret is, that the silly sophistries of pretended Statesmen, aided by the illusions of a blind and narrow patriotism, should have induced the English people to lavish their blood and treasure in the vain hope and purpose of bending their distant countrymen to a yoke themselves had, after many fierce and sanguinary struggles, cast off and trampled beneath their feet. Yet not wholly without redeeming lights is that dark and troubled picture. The heart swells with mournful pride, and the moistened eye kindles with a subdued exultation, as we mark the development upon a distant soil of the old spirit which has placed an island, almost lost amidst the storms and tempests of the Northern Ocean, in the van of civilisation—the calm speech and the determined purpose, the resolution, at all hazards, to hold fast by the sacred rights bequeathed by a great ancestry. No spasmodic outburst there of passionate, unstable discontent—no 'straw on fire' of hot, inconstant passion. 'We have counted the cost,' they say, 'and find nothing so dreadful as slavery.' They had been else unworthy of their name and race; for were not the *elite* of these people the descendants, the immediate descendants, of the men who had left the British shores during the intervals of triumphant despotism which occurred during the long struggle terminated by the Revolution of 1688?—men amongst

whom, but for an accident, would have been Hampden, Cromwell, Ireton; the stubborn old Puritan breed, in short, with all its virtues and all its prejudices; Solemn-League-and-Covenant hill-side folk—the very last people, one would suppose, with whom a wise minister would seek to play a high prerogative game? The old fire had frequently blazed forth, too, in the new States. The authorities of Massachusetts sheltered Goffe and Whalley, who had sat in judgment upon Charles I., from the vengeance of his son; and when compelled to proclaim the Restoration, strictly forbade all rejoicings, even to the drinking the king's health. This feeling was probably strengthened, if not chiefly excited, by the savage deaths inflicted by the restored government upon that sincere, enthusiastic fanatic Hugh Peters, and the celebrated Sir Harry Vane. Peters, a native of Massachusetts had been for many years a favourite preacher at Salem. A few hours before he was hanged, he bade his only child, a daughter, 'go home to New England, and trust in God there.' Sir Harry Vane, who, spite of Cromwell's denunciative exclamation, was a great and sterling patriot, and mild, tolerant withal upon religious matters—a rare virtue in those days—had been an exceedingly popular Governor of Massachusetts; and there, as well as in Rhode Island, to which he had also been a great benefactor, his memory was held in honour, and his

violent and illegal death, it should seem, vindictively mourned. This State declared in 1692 'that no tax could be valid without the consent of the local authorities;' for the project of taxing the unrepresented colonies was, it must be borne in mind, no sudden impulse of George III. and his advisers. It had been long contemplated, although, till Mr. Grenville, no Statesman had been found mad enough to attempt to carry the design into execution. Sir Robert Walpole, not the most scrupulous and constitutional Minister this country has known, when defeated in his Excise scheme, was urged by Sir William Keith, the Governor of Virginia, to tax the American colonies. The wary baronet was wiser than his counsellor. 'I have,' he replied, 'Old England against me already; do you think I want New England also?' In 1704 the protest of Massachusetts was renewed by New York and other States. Nay, Virginia, and in the Carolinas, where the British connection was the most ardently cherished, declared as early as 1651, 'that the right of taxation rested solely in the House of Burgesses'—so thoroughly warned were the British ministers of the certain resistance they must encounter! It must not be forgotten either by persons desirous of accurately measuring the extent of the wisdom and foresight displayed by those gentlemen, that the British colonists, at the time it was resolved to carry the long-meditated design into execution, had

enormously increased in power and resources, and were placed in much more favourable circumstances for defence and resistance than at any former period of their history. The victory of Wolfe, and other triumphs, sealed by the treaty of 1763, had relieved them of their late powerful and dangerous neighbours the French, and their allies the Indians. Their numbers were not much short of three millions, and the development of their commercial enterprise was so great—in the whale-fishery, for example—as detailed in 1775 before the House of Commons, as to cause Mr. Burke to exclaim, 'What in the world is equal to it?' Having attained this degree of growth and prosperity, it was resolved to tax them for the benefit of the Imperial revenue, on the by no means invalid plea, that as great expenses had been incurred in expelling the French, and giving peace to the colonies, they should contribute something towards the Imperial exchequer. At the same time, however the colonists were told that they could have no *representation* in the British House of Commons. And on this bigoted notion, that the House of Commons was already made up—complete—perfect—and could bear no fresh intrusion, the whole affair hinged. What a lesson is this fact calculated to teach!

Mr. George Grenville, urged by George III.—who, it clearly appears from his since published private correspondence with Lord North, was throughout

fanatical in his insistance upon the right and duty of England to tax America—gave the signal for confusion, tumult, and ultimate war, by passing, March, 1765, with the concurrence of large majorities in both Houses of Parliament, a Bill to impose stamp duties on the peaceful and loyal colonists, who required nothing of this country but permission to love and respect her, and leave to contribute, by the recognised authority of their own representative assemblies, such expenses as it might appear England had incidentally taken upon herself on their behalf or in their defence. Happily the fortunes of Great Britain are beyond the power of Acts of Parliament to permanently damage, the spirit and energy of the people sufficing to redeem, though sometimes at a frightful cost, the mistakes of legislators. Were it not for the lamentable consequences which resulted from the doings of the different Ministries that led and continued the attack upon the franchises and immunities of our separated countrymen, it would be amusing to remark their alternate rashness and cowardice, their bold words and childish acts, their high-sounding promises and impotent conclusions. A glance, though only a brief one, is instructive.

The American Stamp Duties Bill was, of course, indignantly rejected by the colonists. Mobs paraded the cities, bearing aloft the obnoxious Act, surmouted by a death's head, and the words 'England's folly

and America's ruin;' lawyers bound themselves to the nation and each other to use only unstamped paper; women formed themselves into associations, pledged not to speak to, much less marry, any of the other sex who should presume to buy or use stamps; the entire people, in a word, entered into a solemn league and covenant to resist by every means in their power the odious edict. Well, the Grenville Ministry quitted office, and the Rockingham administration, which succeeded, repealed the hated and unproductive Bill; but at the same time deprived the repeal of all efficacy or value by a solemn reservation of the only point really in dispute—the *right* of Parliament to tax the unrepresented colonies!

Another Cabinet succeeded; and Mr. Charles Townshend introduced and carried a Bill, intended, doubtless, in the plenitude of the Ministerial wisdom, to benefit *both* countries, by levying duties on British manufactured goods—glass, china, paper, painters' colours—imported into the colonies—besides a duty of 3d. per lb. on tea. This curious measure excited as fierce an opposition as the Stamp Act. The death of Mr. Townshend caused the break-up of this Ministry, of which the Earl of Chatham, it must be stated, was the nominal, though inactive chief. The Duke of Grafton next succeeded to power, or at least to office; and Lord Hillsborough, Secretary of State, wrote to the Governors of the American provinces to state

that the Cabinet introducing a Bill for the repeal of the duties on 'paper, glass, china, and colours,' as 'contrary to the true principles of commerce.' After some delay, this promise was redeemed, but at the same time resolved that the impost upon tea should remain! Upon the firm maintenance of that threepenny duty both Ministers and Parliament resolved, as upon a thing necessary for the dignity of the King's crown, the integrity and prosperity of the Empire, the supremacy of Parliament, the safety of the Constitution, and many other admirable things very eloquently dilated upon at the time, but scarcely worth recapitulating now.

The political scene again changes, and we find ourselves in the presence of Lord North's (son of the Earl of Guildford) Cabinet. The opposition of the indignant colonists to the miserable and aggressive measures of the British Ministers continuing as vehement as ever, and merchants and manufacturers beginning to find, in consequence of the general refusal of the colonists to purchase any British commodities, that trade and commerce were rapidly declining under the expedients devised for their maintenance and extension, a stroke of remarkable financial generalship was resolved upon by the new Administration. They granted such a reduction on the British duty on tea as enabled the East India Company to sell the article to the colonists at so

reduced a rate, that the tax of 3d. per lb. would not raise the price to the consumer. This device was much applauded at the time. The partisans of the Minister were confident that it would reconcile all differences; the Americans would of course surrender the principle so long contended for, if they could only save their pockets; and the King's Government by giving back with one hand what they snatched with the other, would prove themselves alike the able champions of the prerogative of the Crown and the welfare of the people.

The success of this scheme did not at all correspond with the expectations of its promoters. The tea cargoes were in some ports forbidden by the authorities to be landed; and in Boston harbour, on the 18th of December, 1773, a mob of persons, disguised as Mohawk Indians, boarded the *Dartmouth* East India tea-ship, and threw its cargo overboard. This done, they retired without committing any other damage, or offering any violence or insult to the crew.

It was determined by the British ministry to visit the consequences of this outrage upon the entire community of the State in which it was committed. A bill was passed to fine the town of Boston to the value of the tea thrown overborad. This was seriously defended upon the precedents that London had been fined in the time of Charles II, because some unknown persons had slain Dr. Lamb; and that Edinburgh had been

amerced in a large sum for not having prevented the mob from hanging Captain Porteous. They might as well have adduced the law of the Conqueror, which levied a fine on any county or hundred where a Norman should be found slain. The essential distinction that London and Edinburgh, whether justly or unjustly, were punished by recognised authorities, was overlooked, or treated as of no importance. Boston was also deprived of its privileges as a port of customs, which were transferred to Salem. These measures, in the opinion of those who maintain the right of the English parliament to tax and bind America, may have some show of justice, but not even they can justify the subsequent acts of the minister, who, in his bill 'for the better regulating government in the province of Massachusetts,' entirely repealed the charter of William and Mary, and vested the nomination of councillors, judges, magistrates, and sheriffs in the crown, and in some cases in the governor. In other words, the ministry, with the aid of parliament, trampled under foot the constitution of Massachusetts, and erected an unmitigated despotism in its stead! It was also enacted that any person accused of treason, murder, or other capital offence, if alleged to be committed in defence of the measures of the British Government, might, at the pleasure of the Governor, be removed to England for trial—that is to say, as every lawyer knows, and knew, be withdrawn from all chance of punishment.

These outrageous proceedings, which it is impossible to palliate, much less to justify, were carried with a very high hand indeed. Mr. Ballen, the agent for Massachusetts, was refused a hearing by the House of Commons; and the respectful prayer of the American resident in London, that honourable gentlemen 'would not drive a long-suffering and gallant people to the last resources of despair,' was treated with contemptuous indifference. The truth was, the Ministry were determined to put down all resistance by force, and they replied only by a lofty and disdainful silence to every effort made to turn them from their fatal course.

The colonists were thoroughly persuaded that the outrage in Boston harbour was but a pretext eagerly seized by the Ministry to carry into effect a long-since-foregone determination, that of restricting the general liberties of America. This suspicion derived countenance from the previous discovery of a number of letters written by Governor Hutchinson and Judge Oliver of Massachusetts to Mr. Whately, a member of Parliament, and secretary to the Minister, Mr. George Grenville. Hutchinson and Oliver urged upon the Ministry that the colonists were not fit 'for what are called English liberties,' and recommended the adoption of measures to modify, in a despotic sense, the popular Constitutions of the American provinces. This treasonable correspondence (it was surely nothing

less in a moral point of view, coming from men who had sworn to respect and maintain those liberties?) had been placed in Dr. Franklin's hands by a Dr. Hugh Williamson, with an injunction to keep secret the source from which he obtained it. Franklin immediately transmitted them to America, where their publication produced an immense sensation; and the impeachment of Governor Hutchinson was soon afterwards demanded. Dr. Franklin, whose incessant and zealous efforts to heal the unhappy differences between the mother country and the colonies had been warmly and frequently acknowledged by the most eminent persons—amongst others by Chief-Justice Pratt, the judge who first held that 'general warrants' were illegal, and better known as Lord Camden—was summoned before the council relative to the demand of impeachment. The abuse with which the single-minded and amiable philosopher was assailed by Wedderburne, the Attorney-General, afterwards Lord Loughborough, a man now only remembered because he *did* abuse Dr. Franklin, is an amusing specimen of the virulence of a loose-tongued lawyer, salaried to exhibit simulated indignation. First charging Franklin with having obtained the letters with fraudulent and corrupt means—'unless, indeed, he stole them from the person who stole them'—Wedderburne thus proceeded: 'I hope, my Lords, you will brand this man for the honour of his country,

of Europe, of mankind. . . . Into what company will he hereafter appear with an unembarrassed face, or the honest expression of virtue? I ask, my Lords, if the revengeful temper attributed by poetic fiction only to the bloody African is not surpassed by the coolness and apathy of the wily American?' This rabid nonsense, according to Dr. Priestley, threw the Lords of the Council into ecstasies of mirth: 'even Lord Gower laughed; and the only man who behaved with decency was Lord North.' Franklin listened to it all in silence, returning not a word; only, when he took off the Court suit of Manchester spotted velvet which he had worn on the occasion, he mentally resolved never to put it on again.

Washington, the First President.

Washington, who had borne patiently with the people's mistakes, was not intoxicated with their homage. He knew both their weakness and their strength, and could excuse their follies for the sake of their virtues. He had always confidence in them that, however temporarily misled by passion or prejudice, they would come right at last. Some time before his election to the Presidency, when calumnies of all sorts were rife against him, and wild counsels, which, if embodied in action, would infallibly have brought ruin to the State, had obtained an ephemeral

popularity, he thus expresses himself: "I cannot think that Providence has done so much for us for nothing. I cannot but hope that the good sense of the people will prevail over its prejudices. The Mighty Sovereign of the Universe has conducted us too long on the path to happiness and fame to abandon us in the midst. By our folly and evil conduct we may for a time wander from the way, but I have confidence there remains sufficent sense and virtue amongst us to regain the right road before we are utterly lost.'

The popularity of the President did not long suffer eclipse. The sense and virtue of the country rallied in his defence; the clouds of prejudice and passion gradually exhaled in the increasing light of truth; and before his second presidency had expired, Washington was again the idol—the 'father of his people.' Such magic is there in RIGHT.

A brief illness, the immediate cause of which was his being caught in a shower of rain whilst out riding on his estate at Mount Vernon, terminated his eventful career on the 14th of December, 1799. He expired surrounded by his weeping family and friends, his servants amongst the most sorrowing of those friends. He suffered considerably, but no murmur of complaint or impatience escaped him. 'I am dying hard,' he observed with a faint, pale smile to the physician in attendance, 'but it will soon be over.'

Thus calmly and resignedly passed away that child-like, giant man; and, his earthly mission well accomplished, he slept peacefully with his fathers, having lived 68 years.

'Let me be buried privately, and let no funeral oration be pronounced over my remains,' was one of his last injunctions. Those who have disobeyed that solemn command have done so vainly, for Time alone can write his fitting epitaph—that future and advancing Time, in whose clear day the grim and fantastic shadows mistaken for true heroes in the darkness and twilight of the world are destined to pass away and be forgotten, but which light from heaven will only add new lustre to the *aureole* of moral beauty, dignity, and worth which encircles the brow of the great American.

The lesson to the world, and especially to conquerors and their dupes and tools, is the oft-quoted passage in which he bequeaths his swords to his nephews: 'These swords are accompanied with an injunction not to unsheath them for the purpose of shedding blood, except it be for self-defence, or in defence of their country and its liberties; and in the latter case, to keep them unsheathed till the object be accomplished, and prefer falling with them in their hands to the relinquishment thereof.' Words which, whilst they express his and every just person's abhorrence of aggressive war, must ever stir as with a trumpet

the heart of every man compelled to arm in defence of home, freedom, and country.

'Behold the man! ye crowned and ermined train
And learn from him the royal art to reign;
No guards surround him or his walks infest,
No cuirass meanly shields his noble breast;
His the defence which despots ne'er can find,
The love, the prayers, the interest of mankind.
Ask ye what spoils his far-famed arms have won,
What cities sacked, what hapless realms undone?
Though Monmouth's field supports no vulgar fame,
Though captured York shall long preserve his fame,
I quote not these—a nobler scene behold,
Wide cultured fields fast ripening into gold!
There, as his toil the cheerful peasant plies,
New marts are opening, and new spires arise;
Here commerce smiles, and there *en groupe* are seen
The useful arts and those of sprightlier mien:
To cheer the whole the Muses tune their lyre,
And Independence leads the white-robed choir.
Trophies like these, to vulgar minds unknown,
Were sought and prized by Washington alone:
From these, with all his country's honours crowned,
As sage in councils as in arms renowned;
All of a piece, and faithful to the last,
Great in this action as in all the past,
He turns, and urges as his last request,
Remote from power his weary head may rest.'

—St. John Honeywood,'
an American poet and contemporary of Washington.

—(*Washington and his Contemporaries. Chambers's Information for the People*).

The Relative Cost of a Monarchy and a Republic.

"Mr. Disraeli's attempt to prove that the English Monarchy is less expensive than the American Republic was a perversion of facts, and a misrepresentation of figures. He said that her Majesty had considerable estates in the country which she had given up, and the revenues from them had gone into the public exchequer. The hon. gentleman did not inform us to what estates he alluded. At the present moment the Queen is in possession of large estates at Balmoral, at Osborne, and in the West of London, the revenues of which the country does *not* receive. Besides, she has vast sums of money which she claims and holds very securely as her private property, and from which the country does not benefit in any way. Did Mr. Disraeli refer to the Crown lands? If so, they never belonged to the Queen, and, therefore, she could not have given them up. Is it, however, correct to allege that the revenues derived from the Crown lands are equal to the annual sum we pay to the Royal Family? That sum, according to the Blue Book and other official documents, amounts certainly to over £700,000 a-year. It must not be understood, of course, that these figures represent anything approaching the cost of the Monarchy or the Government of this country. The annual expenses of the former may be reckoned, without the slightest exaggeration, as exceeding a million sterling. The

£700,000 simply represents the net cash that is officially acknowledged to be paid in each year to the Royal Family. Now, towards this £700,000, what is obtained from the Crown lands? There was paid into the Exchequer in 1847, £68,000; in 1854, £272,000; in 1855-6, £260,000; in 1870-1, £385,000; in 1872, £375,000; and in 1873, £458,903. Thus it will be seen that, until the last few years, the Crown land receipts were exceedingly low, and even now they do not equal anything like the cost of the Queen and her family.

Mr. Disraeli said: 'I will deal with the cost of sovereignty of the United States of America. Gentlemen, there is no analogy between the position of Queen Victoria and the President of the United States.' There is much truth in this remark; there *is* no analogy between the two. The President of the United States has to work; and the Queen, as the right hon. gentleman remarked on a former occasion, has become 'physically and morally incapacitated from performing her duties.' A man who aspires to the Presidential chair must possess political ability, while a knowledge of politics has not been deemed a necessary qualification in the occupant of the English throne. Besides, the Queen's salary is £385,000 a-year, and the President's is but £9,170.

In dealing with the relative costs of the two forms of Government, Mr. Disraeli did not put the case

fairly. He was careful to speak of the cost of the American Cabinet, but he never mentioned the cost of our English Cabinet. The English Cabinet, under the Premiership of Mr. Gladstone, was composed of seventeen members, who received annually between them in salaries, £68,000. The American Administrative Department is composed of seven members, who receive among them £10,270. In England some members get £5,000, and one as much as £10,000 per year. In America no member gets more than £1,470. If, therefore, we take the cost of the Royal Family and Cabinet in England, and compare it with the cost of the President and Cabinet in America, the latter will be seen to be considerably the cheaper.

Then, to make the case stronger, in the Finance Accounts for 1872-3, we have for the Great Departments of the English Government — Treasury, £54,681; Home Office, £81,786; Foreign Office, £58,707; Colonial Office, £31,239; Privy Council, £28,179; Board of Trade, £96,170; to say nothing of Scotland and Ireland; while the costs of the War Office and Admiralty are (significantly) not stated. Add £45,054 for the expenses of the House of Lords; £50,082 for those of the House of Commons, together with the £700,000 for the Royal Family; and we find the costs of the English Government to be immensely greater than those of the American, which, as admitted by Mr. Disraeli himself, are only between £700,000

and £800,000. In estimating the expense of the American Government, it must not be overlooked that its representatives in Congress are paid, an advantage we should do well to emulate; for if men are sent to Parliament to do useful work, they ought to be remunerated for it. If that were done, we should not find so many empty benches as we do when the money of the country is being voted away. In America the sovereignty is the people. There the people pay to rule themselves, while here we pay Royalty to rule us. In America the sovereignty supports itself; in this country it is supported by something outside of itself. Surely, then, that which is self-supporting is more economical than that which depends on something extraneous for its existence. In America its £700,000 or £800,000 are distributed among nearly five hundred persons, but in England nearly that amount is given to one family alone who do comparatively nothing that is beneficial to the Commonwealth.

There is a striking contrast also between the two countries in the expenditure for diplomacy. As shown by Mr. Bradlaugh, in his letter, written in 1872, to Mr. Disraeli,. America pays her Ambassador in London a yearly salary of £3,215, and the total cost of the American Embassy here is £4,336. Our Ambassador at New York receives the sum of £5,000 per year, and an annual allowance of £1,000 for house rent, and the total cost of our Embassy in America is

£8,150, or nearly double. The Americans pay their Ambassador at Paris £3,670, and the total cost of the Embassy is £4,146. We give our Parisian Ambassador £10,000, and the total cost of our Embassy is £13,595. Thus diplomacy in France costs America less than one-third of our expenditure. In England the Lord Chief Justice receives an annual salary of £8,000, while the same functionary in America is paid less than £1,700 a-year.

Many other instances could be given to show that Mr. Disraeli was decidedly inaccurate in his comparisons of the expenses of the two countries. But, leaving particular departments, what is the total cost of each Government? The general expenditure of the Government of America for 1871 is put down in 'The Statesman's Year Book' as £58,012,584, while the general cost of England for the same period was £69,698,539 12s. 2d. The advantage to America will appear the greater when we remember that, according to the census of the United States in 1870, her population was 38,555,983 persons; Great Britain and Ireland, 31,817,108. Territory of Great Britain and Ireland is about 119,924 square miles; United States, 2,933,588 square miles. This is exclusive of the vast district known as "Russian America." Notwithstanding the much larger population, and the greater extent of territory, the Republic has a much less expenditure than the Monarchy.

Too much importance is not here attached to what has been termed the 'cheap argument.' Because an article is cheap, it does not, therefore, follow that it is preferable to that which is more expensive. True economy consists in the usefulness of that which is purchased. Monarchy has proved itself dear at any price, because it lacks the elements of good government. The basis of sound legislation is the public will, made known through a fair and comprehensive system of representation; and as this advantage is recognised and enforced by Republicanism, its claims are established as superior to Royalty, even if it were not less expensive."—(*Charles Watts.*)

"We are often told that party organization has become so dictatorial, so despotic in America, that no one not chosen by the preliminary convention, no one, in short, whose name is not upon the party ticket, has any chance of election to an office. To those who reflect upon the matter, it would seem as though this is but a consequence of the existence of Party, and of the system of Local Representation: in England itself the like abuse is not unknown. Where neither party possesses overwhelming strength, division is failure; and some knot or other of pushing men must be permitted to make the selection of a candidate, to which, when made, the party must adhere, or suffer a defeat. As to the composition of the nominating conventions, the grossest mis-statements have been made to us in

England, for we have been gravely assured that a nation which is admitted to present the greatest mass of education and intelligence with the smallest intermixture of ignorance and vice of which the world has knowledge, allows itself to be dictated to in the matter of the choice of its rulers by caucuses and conventions composed of the idlest and most worthless of its population. Bribery, we have been told, reigns supreme in these assemblies; the nation's interest is but a phrase; individual selfishness the true dictator of each choice; the name of party is but a cloak for private ends, and the wire pullers are equalled in rascality only by their nominees.

It need hardly be shown that, were these stories true, a people so full of patriotic sentiment as that which lately furnished a million and a half of volunteers for a national war, would without doubt be led to see its safety in the destruction of conventions and their wire-pullers—of party government itself, if necessary. It cannot be conceived that the American people would allow its institutions to be stultified and law itself insulted to secure the temporary triumph of this party or of that on any mere question of the day.

The secret of the power of caucus and convention is, general want of time on the part of the community. Your honest and shrewd Western farmer, not having himself the leisure to select his candidate, is fain to

let caucus or convention choose for him. In practice, however, the evil is far from great: the party caucus, for its own interest, will, on the whole, select the fittest candidate available, and, in any case, dares not, except perhaps in New York city, fix its choice upon a man of known bad character. Even where Party is most despotic, a serious mistake committed by one of the nominating conventions will seldom fail to lose its side so many votes as to secure a triumph for the opponents.

King Caucus is a great monarch, however; it would be a mistake to despise him, and conventions are dear to the American people—at least, it would seem so, to judge from their number. Since I have been in America, there have been sitting, besides doubtless a hundred others, the names of which I have not noticed, the Philadelphia 'Copper Johnson Wigwam,' or assembly of the Presidential Party (of which the Radicals say that it is but 'the Copperhead organization with a fresh snout'), a dentists' convention, a phrenological convention, a pomological congress, a school-teachers' convention, a Fenian convention, an eight-hour convention, an insurance companies' convention, and a loyal soldiers' convention. One is tempted to think of the assemblies of '48 in Paris, and of the caricatures representing the young bloods of the Paris Jockey Club being addressed by their President as 'Citoyens Vicomtes,' whereas, when

the *cafe* waiters met in their congress, it was 'Messieurs les Garçons-limonadiers.'

The pomological convention was an extremely jovial one, all the horticulturists being whisky-growers themselves, and having a proper wish to compare their own with their neighbours 'Bourbon' or 'Old Rye.' Caucuses (or cauci: which is it?) of this kind suggest a derivation of this name for what many consider a low American proceeding, from an equally low Latin word of similar sound and spelling. In spite of the phrase 'a dry caucus' being not unknown in the temperance State of Maine, many might be inclined to think that caucuses, if not exactly vessels of grace, were decidedly 'drinking vessels;' but Americans tell you that the word is derived from the phrase a 'caulker's meeting,' caulkers being peculiarly given to noise.

The cry against conventions is only a branch of that against 'politicians,' which is continually being raised by the adherents of the side which happens at the moment to be the weaker, and which evidently helps to create the evils against which its authors are protesting. It is now the New York Democrats who tell such stories as that of the Columbia District census-taker going to the Washington house of a wealthy Boston man to find out his religious tenets. The door was opened by a black boy, to whom the white man began: 'What's your name?' 'Sambo, sah, am my

Christian name.' 'Wall, Sambo, is your *master* a Christian?' To which Sambo's indignant answer was: 'No, sah! Mass member ob Congress, sah!' When the Democrats were in power, it was the Republicans of Boston and the Cambridge professors who threw out sly hints, and violent invectives too, against the whole tribe of 'politicians.' Such unreasoning outcries are to be met only by bare facts; but were a jury of readers of the debates in Parliament and in Congress to be empanelled to decide whether political immorality were not more rife in England than in America, I should, for my part, look forward with anxiety to the result.

The organization of the Republican party is hugely powerful; it has its branches in every township and district in the Union; but it is strong, not in the wiles of crafty plotters, not in the devices of unknown politicians, but in the hearts of the loyal people of the country. If there were nothing else to be said to Englishmen on the state of parties in America, it should be sufficient to point out that, while the 'Democracy' claim the Mozart faction of New York and the shoddy aristocracy, the pious New Englanders and their sons in the North-West are, by a vast majority, Republicans; and no 'side issues' should be allowed to disguise the fact that the Democratic is the party of New York, the Republican the party of America.

There was a time, as England knows, when the thinking men of Boston, and the Cambridge professors, Emerson, Russell, Lowell, Asa Gray, and a dozen more of almost equal fame, morally seceded from their country's councils, and were followed in their secession by the younger men. 'The best men in America stand aloof from politics,' it was said.

The country from which these men seceded was not the America of to-day: it was the union which South Carolina ruled. From it the Cambridge professors 'came out,' not because they feared to vex their nerves with the shock of public argument and action, but because the course of the slaveholders was not their course. Hating the wrongs they saw but could not remedy, they separated themselves from the wrong-doers; another matter, this, from the 'hating hatred' of our culture class in England.

In 1863 and 1864, there came the reckoning. When America was first brought to see the things that had been done in her name, and at her cost, and, rising in her hitherto unknown strength, struck the noblest blow for freedom that the world has seen, the men who had been urging on the movement from without at once re-entered the national ranks, and marched to victory. Of the men who sat beneath Longfellow, and Agassiz, and Emerson, whole battalions went forth to war. From Oberlin almost every male student and professor marched, and the

university teaching was left in the women's hands. Out of 8000 school teachers in Pennsylvania, of whom 300 alone were draughted, 3000 volunteered for the war. Everywhere the students were foremost among the Volunteers, and from that time forward America and her thinkers were at one.

After all, there is not in America a greater wonder than the Englishman himself, for it is to this continent that you must come to find him in full possession of his powers. Two hundred and fifty millions of people speak or are ruled by those who speak the English tongue, and inhabit a third of the habitable globe; but, at the present rate of increase, in sixty years there will be two hundred and fifty millions of Englishmen dwelling in the United States alone. America has somewhat grown since the time when it was gravely proposed to call her Alleghania, after a chain of mountains which, looking from this western side, may be said to skirt her eastern border, and the loftiest peaks of which are but half the height of the very passes of the Rocky Mountains.

America is becoming, not English merely, but world-embracing in the variety of its type; and, as the English element has given language and history to that land, America offers the English race the moral directorship of the globe, by ruling mankind through Saxon institution and the English tongue. Through America, England is speaking to the world. —(*Greater Britain. By Sir Chas. Dilke.*)

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

"A brief review of the causes which led to the decline and fall of this mightiest of empires is one of the most interesting and instructive in the whole range of history. We have seen Rome originally founded by a rude and wandering tribe, joined by the neighbouring shepherds and outlaws, rising from a village or hamlet to become pre-eminent in valour, wisdom, intelligence, and dominion; and we perceive that such important results arising from so narrow a foundation, were the fruits of superior excellence. When we contemplate the manners and habits of the Roman people in the early ages of the Republic, we observe them distinguished by temperance, frugality, strict integrity, and rigid military discipline. In those times the patricians, when in the country, forgetting or laying aside the distinction of ranks, and labouring personally in the cultivation of their farms, only anxious to set the example of an industrious and simple patriotism. Called from rural labour to take the command of armies, when their duty had been fulfilled cheerfully

returning to their former pursuits We have the examples of Cincinnatus, Curius, the elder Cato, Scipio, Africanus, and others. Indeed the names of some of the most distinguished families as the Lentuli, Pisones, and Fabii, were assumed expressly to mark the skill and success of the bearers of them in the cultivation of particular vegetables; and it was accounted more noble to belong to one of the thirty-one rustic than to either of the four city tribes. The history of all nations proves to us that there is an inseparable connection between the morals of a people and their political prosperity. To limit to Republics alone the necessity of virtue as a principle is a chimerical and absurd notion, fraught with dangerous consequences; for no political system, however excellent its fabric, can possess any permanence of duration without that best of qualifications—virtue in the hearts of the people. The love of our country, and a desire for its rational freedom, are noble and virtuous feelings; the spirit of patriotism, however, and a general depravity of manners cannot exist together in the same age and country.

The national character of the Romans underwent a remarkable change for the worse shortly after the destruction of the rival, Carthage; and in the last ages of the Republic avarice and ambition, unrestrained by honesty or moral principle, were the chief motives of the Roman conquests. In preceding times

they had conquered and been acknowledged as masters, not always by physical power, but frequently by what we understand in the present day as moral force; that is, they protected the lives and property of the conquered, conferred on them the blessings of rational liberty, and governed them with more justice and humanity than the rulers they dispossessed, perfectly illustrating the proverb, that while 'Righteousness exalteth a nation, sin is the ruin of any people.' But at length this wise course of policy became changed. It was a sufficient reason for going to war, that a country presented a tempting object to the rapacity and ambition of their military leaders. The conquest of Italy having paved the way for the reduction of foreign nations, the Romans imported with their wealth the manners, luxuries, and worst of all the vices of the countries they subdued. The generals returned not as formerly, after a successful campaign, to the labours of the field and a life of temperance and industry, but they became the governors of kingdoms and provinces, and at the termination of their command abroad, disdaining the restraints of a subject, they could be satisfied with little or nothing less than sovereignty at home. The armies, debauched by the plunder of kingdoms, were ready to support them in all their schemes of ambition; and the populace, won by bribes and other means of corruption, took part with that chief which best could pay for their favour and

support. This unhappy state of circumstances was accompanied by a universal depravity of manners and conduct—chastity, honesty, sincerity, and moral worth having fallen into decay and disuse. In a Government thus destroyed by the utter want of those virtues under which it had originally flourished and become great, it was of little consequence in the hands of what particular individual, demagogue, usurper, or emperor, its ruin was finally consummated. History has indeed shown that States and Empires have their periods of duration; but by instructing us in the causes which have produced their decline and downfall, it inculcates the salutary lesson that they themselves are in general the masters of their destiny, and that all nations may or ought to aspire at immortality.—(*Sir Wm. Boyd, Hist. Lit.* Vol ii., pp. 201-3).

"The ancient Governments of Greece and Rome however, were not, strictly speaking, Republics; they more closely resembled oligarchies, although in fact that of the Roman approached very nearly to what we understand by a Constitutional form of Government. In a Republic the people are supreme; in an oligarchy the nobility hold a greater share of power, and in what is called a Constitutional Government the nobility and people have certain rights and privileges fixed and defined by law. The system of the Romans certainly resembled the last more than either of the others;

defective in the serious advantage of their being no permanent head of the State endowed with real power; and here an evil arose apparently inseparable from that system. Bodies of men usurped and monopolised an undue share of power, which led to a state of constant jealousy between the patricians and the plebeians. The third dictatorship held by Cæsar, differed in a most important point from that office when filled by Marius and Sylla. The Senate having conferred it upon Cæsar, and the appointment being confirmed by the people, he thus acquired it with a legal title. Equal to his predecessors in bravery, superior to them in talent, but immeasurably so in that magnanimity which consists in the pardon and forgetfulness of injury, so correctly expressed in the elegant compliment paid to him by Cicero, 'that he forgot nothing but the injuries done to himself;' it is difficult to regard the fate of this illustrious man otherwise than with feelings of sincere regret. There is much in the character of Julius Cæsar of an endearing nature, with which every amiable disposition can sympathise. He was gifted with an innate kindliness of heart, a degree of goodness and considerate generosity rarely to be found. It is pleasing to say that while master of the Empire of the then civilised world he never shed a drop of blood wantonly, nor ever committed an act of oppressive cruelty. His virtues and freedom from personal selfishness led to his

death; had he condescended to attend to the intimations given him, or read the document put into his hands, containing the names and intentions of the conspirators, he might have prevented the catastrophe, and lived for many years to confer happiness on the Roman people. The conspirators, on the other hand, could not be ignorant of the actual state of their country; they must have known, from preceding events, that patriotism and virtue had long sunk under venality and corruption. The opinion of Jugurtha, expressed about ninety years before the epoch of Cæsar's power, was founded on observation and experience when he declared that Rome and all her inhabitants were to be sold if a purchaser of sufficient wealth could be found. It is difficult to suppose that they had not remarked from Catiline's conspiracy and numerous other circumstances the unfitness of their countrymen to govern themselves; consequently that a talented and beneficent ruler assuming the reins of State would be for all parties a fortunate circumstance. But no; looking upon their conduct in the most favourable light, they dreamed an impossibility, in defiance of facts, that Rome could again be restored to a state of virtuous simplicity, and their homicidal act was a failure. The author, however, does not feel justified in taking such a view. Regarding Brutus, their leader, he cannot help for one moment condemning such a specimen of patriotism, exhibiting the crime of

ingratitude in its deepest dye by the assassination of a generous benefactor. The conduct of this man has been viewed more leniently than that of his brother assassins, who are considered to have been swayed by feelings of envy and malignity. They evidently disregarded the circumstance that the authority which Julius Cæsar had received was used by him for the correction of abuses and the suppression of those disorders to which Rome had so long been subject, and to which he alone was capable of applying a remedy. Notwithstanding the unlimited power conferred, the Roman people still loved him, and their emotions of grief and resentment at his violent death led them to sacrifice one of his friends under the mistaken idea that he was concerned in the crime. It is a remarkable circumstance that not one of the individuals connected with the murder of Julius Cæsar escaped a sudden and violent death, falling either by their own hands or the sword of the executioner. To every one guided by human feelings the deed which destroyed this illustrious man will be looked upon not only as an act of wanton cruelty, but also as a great political blunder. It led to most unfortunate results. A second triumvirate was immediately formed, civil war commenced, proscriptions and massacres followed; many amiable and talented persons perished. We have lived to see the fall of a modern Cæsar, the late Emperor Napoleon: equal to the former as a warrior, a legislator, a statesman,

and superior to him as an engineer officer. The author has traversed the late Emperor's roads over the Simplon and Cenis: the mind is dazzled by that boldness of genius which could so perfectly subdue the chaos of Nature. Napoleon, however, was miserably defective in those beautiful feelings of innate kindness of heart and magnanimous generosity which so peculiarly characterised the glorious Roman. Had he possessed but a little of them he would have left a powerful throne to his posterity. Ennobled by such sentiments, they would have prevented his crushing the rational liberty of his people; they would have saved him from the meanness of establishing a system of espionage so horrible that four persons could not converse together without one of them being a Government informer; they would not have permitted him to waste the precious blood of a gallant nation in selfish and atrocious schemes of family aggrandizement; and when in exile they would have spared the mighty Emperor, whom half a million of veteran warriors had looked up to as a demi-god, the littleness of passing the remaining years of his life in petty squabbles with the unfortunate man who fulfilled the painful office of his gaoler. The magnanimity of the ancient Cæsar would not have permitted him to survive the retreat from Moscow or the battle of Waterloo. James V. of Scotland died broken-hearted while a young man for the loss at the battle of Solway-moss; but the Emperor

had no heart to break. After acknowledging with all due praise the transcendent abilities of Napoleon, it is difficult to come to any other conclusion than that he was a man devoid of principle, and not worthy the unbounded sacrifices made in his behalf by the high-spirited and generous nation of France."—[*Ibid.* Vol. ii, pp. 320-24.]

CHAPTER IX.

THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

FRANCE under Louis Phillip gave the vote to 200,000 men out of the seven million adult men living at that time. The Republic gave universal suffrage. Some writers appear to think that the Republics of France have been destroyed or suppressed owing to some inherent defect in the system. The fact is Frenchmen in past times were not Republicans. That there were Republicans before 1789 we know, but the highest estimate in 1793 puts them at 50,000.

Even so late as 1848 they are set down by friends as composing less than 2-7ths of the whole voters. Louis Napoleon could not have obtained the number of votes he did if the majority of the people had been earnest Republicans. Still Englishmen should remember that Frenchmen lived at that time in terror of brute force. The fact of being known to be a Republican was sufficient to involve a man's liberty, and bring ruin to his family. Yet to their honour be it said, 600,000 Republicans went to the poll against the usurper, and had it not been for the ship loads of Republicans sent out of the country, many more would have done the same. There is ample evidence

of the rapid increase of Republicans since 1848—notably in the vote of 1869.

In that year the electoral districts were so arranged as to give a majority to the Imperialist deputies, who polled 4,500,000; still there is this important fact, showing the rapid growth of Republicanism among the voters, the number of votes given for the opposition candidates was within 1,000,000 of that of the Imperialist deputies. From the great French Revolution up to this hour, the people of France have been in advance of all other peoples of Europe, in attempting to give the modern parliamentary and social systems a fair trial. The disasters that have overtaken those efforts are sufficiently well known, and are the principal grounds of the hope entertained by the enemies of Republican progress. To the enemy of Republicanism the aspect of the French nation,—patient, united, and practically realising political freedom,—must be anything but reassuring. Great efforts have been made to prevent the establishment of a Government by the will and for the good of the whole nation. Those who know how the country voters are managed in France, as elsewhere, must be filled with amazement at the result of an appeal to the 7 millions of voters among a population of 37 millions of people. Still it is a fact that after years of desperate struggles a great and real Republic is established, surrounded by the old monarchies of Europe.

The Republic of France has peculiarities of its own. The Prime Minister is not "the leader" of the House or president of the Council meetings. The Chamber of Deputies is manifestly the seat of power, just exactly in the same sense as the English House of Commons is; but its business is carried on by a number of committees. The attendance varies from 30 to 40, and only a few hours in a few days of the week. The speeches are usually very short, many of them are said not to exceed half-an-hour in delivery.

The difference between the English and the French Chambers may be briefly indicated by calling the one a talking assembly and the second a working assembly. As regards the so-called violent and revolutionary demands of the extreme members, there is no foundation whatever for popular statements about them. The measures they demand have long been agitated in England, and some of them obtained already.

At the time of writing there is evidence of a Radical party favourable to one House, which advocates the suppression of the Senate and the Presidency. After all, these may prove to be but remnants of monarchical superstitions. That some alteration will be made with regard to both is highly probable.

It is urged that the law of 1875 recognises the possibility of modifications being needed. In a country like France, any institution which does not admit of improvement will come to grief. Still it by

no means follows that the people are *now* prepared to do away with their second House and the name of President. Regard must be had to the history and to the peculiarities of the French people. They have been accustomed to personal rule for ages; it is one of their characteristics to be governed. It may still be necessary, in order to secure obedience to the Republic, to exhibit to the public its personal emblem of power—a President. Whatever will sustain and perpetuate Republican rule must be adopted for the time, however ornamental and useless such may appear to the advanced school of politicians. The people of every nation are necessarily behind the leaders and the philosophers; and such facts must be recognised by all who wish to see the increase of wisdom and justice among the whole nation. The Government, the Church, the Magistracy, the Army, the social institutions; all these may require reforming, but not suddenly. Time is on the side of freedom and truth, and all the sincere friends of France will do well to extend their patience as well as their progressive efforts, in fact—

"Learn to labour and to wait."

Just at the time this volume is passing through the press, there is a general appeal being made to the electors of France, upon the response to which will depend the policy for the next four years. That the Republicans are divided on certain points might be

expected; for, where there is liberty, differences and variety of opinions are expected to exist. The great thing to notice is, whether France still shows an increasing Republican sentiment, and a decreasing sympathy with the Monarchists and Imperialists of the past. So far as we can judge, the tendency is to abandon the old system of things, and with it the supporters of it. The advanced party, who are in favour of the Republic—Democratic and Social—will doubtless be dissatisfied with mere Parliamentary reform; but the only danger that can arise is not from the advocacy of progressive ideas, but from the inability to prevent such advocacy interfering with public order, and the gradual perfecting of the purely political institutions of the country. A Republic once firmly established, and the enemies of progress being rendered incapable of mischief, there will necessarily follow such social institutions, and arrangements as will insure the peace, prosperity, and happiness of the whole of the French people. The differences which will now manifest themselves among the leaders of progress in France will not be those which affect the purpose of the nation, but only those which will determine the speed with which it shall be accomplished.

The present constitution of France was made by the Assembly of 1871, and is dated February 25th, 1875. It places legislative power in the Chamber and the

Senate, and the chief magistrate is called President of the Republic. The Deputies are elected by universal suffrage, adopted by the Assembly, November 11th, 1875, which gives one Deputy to every 100,000 electors, who numbered 9,992,329 in 1878. The only qualification required by voters is that of being 21 years of age, and the only qualifications of a Deputy are that he must be a voter and be 25 years of age.

The Chamber of Deputies consisted in 1878 of 532 members; and the Senate 300 members, who must be Frenchmen 40 years of age. There are 75 life members in the Senate, whose places, when vacant, are filled up; the others are elected by the communes and municipalities, or rather by a certain number of their members selected for that purpose. In October 1878, the Councils selected 43,127 electors, who, in January 1879, met to elect the 225 Senators. The President is elected by a majority of the votes of both Houses for seven years, and is eligible for re-election. He is only responsible in case of high treason. He grants pardons, promulgates the laws, appoints persons to civil, military, and ministerial departments, and the army is at his disposal His salary is £24,000 a-year, with £12,000 for household expenses. The members of both Chambers are paid at a fixed daily wage; the total cost of both Houses being about £416,000 a-year.

The revenue and expenditure for 1879 was over £108,000,000. The immense increase of late years is owing to causes known to all the world. The cost of the war and the indemnity to Germany, 1870-73, was £371,500,000. The National Debt in 1875 was £937,584,280, and the interest £29,936,196.

The army in 1879 numbered 496,442 men.

In 1876 the area of France was 201,900 square miles, and the population, 36,905,788, or 180 persons to every square mile. In 1876 the births exceeded the deaths by 132,608. The preponderance of male to female births has been declining some years. In 1840 it was 106 to 100, in 1876, 105 to 100. The illegitimate or natural children of the whole of France are 7·12 per cent. According to the latest official returns the cultivated land of France is divided as follows:—

50,000	average 600	acres each
500,000	,, 60	,,
5,000,000	,, under 6	,,

According to the returns for 1881 there is an increase of Republicans since the election of 1878.

The New French Chamber, 1881.

The Chamber of Deputies elected in 1878 contained 532 members. The new Chamber will, without counting the Deputies elected for the Colonies, comprise 459 Republicans, 47 Bonapartists, and 41

Monarchists. Of the Republican Deputies elected 39 belong to the Left Centre, 168 to the Left, 206 to the Republican Union, and 46 to the Extreme Left.

The votes of the Republicans numbered 4,500,000, while the whole of their opponents numbered only 1,500,000.

M. Gambetta was present at the ceremony of unveiling the statue of Dupont de l'Eure, and in the course of an address delivered by him he reminded his hearers that that day was the 4th September, the day on which 11 years before the Empire was overthrown and the Provisional Government established. "If France," he said, "was vanquished in 1870 it was because civic virtue was wanting. If she wished now to accomplish her doctrines, France must not again commit them into the hands of an individual, but should deliver them into the keeping of the people and of universal suffrage."

Again, in the evening of the same day, M. Gambetta, replying to a toast in his honour, said he considered that the dominant thought expressed in the late elections was that the Republic inaugurated in 1875 had accomplished the first part of its task in establishing undisputed authority over the whole of France, while to complete the other part of its work it must accomplish a fair measure of the reforms demanded by public opinion. The difficulty consisted in the pace to be followed. Everything could not be

done at once. Some good question must be undertaken and solved before a new one was taken up, otherwise the result would be confusion and division, the country had signified that it approved that method of proceeding. What it wanted was a reforming not a levelling or utopian Republic. They must move forward, but with a practical and attainable object. . . . The new Legislature ought to furnish a majority as fixed and stable as the Republic itself. On assembling it would state what it required, and the paternal power under which they lived would abide by what it said. He felt sure that the time would soon come when on the 4th of September they would be permitted to celebrate the reunion of all Frenchmen under the same flag.

CHAPTER X.

THE SWISS REPUBLIC.

SWITZERLAND has long been the marvel of the political world- a Republic situated in the very midst of the great and proud monarchies and empires. The love of liberty and independence was manifested in that country as early as the 14th century, and probably no people surpassed them in their devotion to it for four centuries. After many struggles the Republic was established on a firm basis in 1815. Since 1848 Switzerland, instead of a number of states more or less independent, has been formed into a united confederacy. The present Constitution, based on the laws passed in that year, received the sanction of the people by a national vote April 19, 1874. It abolishes the penalty of death and all corporal punishments. The legislature and executive Parliament consists of two Houses. Each canton elects two—*i.e.*, 44 members to the States Council, and 135 members to the National Council, the latter having each a constituency of 20,000 persons 20 years of age and

upwards. Only clergymen are excluded from being returned as Deputies. The two Chambers are called the Federal Assembly; the Executive consists of seven members of it, elected for three years. There are a President and a Vice-President elected by the same Assembly annually, and are not eligible every year in succession. Wars and peace alliances and treaties are all controlled by the Assembly alone.

There is also a tribunal, consisting of eleven members, elected for six years by the Assembly. The members of the Council are paid £480 a year each, and the President £600 a year. Most, if not all the persons elected as representatives, both local and national, are either honorary servants of the Republic or receive only nominal remuneration. The total revenue and expenditure, which about balance, are under £1,800,000, taking the past seven years for this average. The national debt is £1,290,000, and property belonging to the State is of about an equivalent value, estimated at £1,400,000. The total debts of the local cantons and communes amount to over £10,000,000.

The Republic forbids the establishment of a standing army, and enacts that every Swiss is liable to serve his country in its defence, the army consisting of all able to bear arms between 20 and 32. The militia extends from the 33rd to the 44th year of each man. The total of the forces are 202,397, made up of all the citizens over 20, free from bodily defects or ill health. The total

cost of the army in 1876 is set down at £586,237. There is a military school, and everyone is trained about a month before being put on the roll, and during his term has to go through annual exercises.

The population is under 3,000,000—the area 16,000 square miles, there being 175 persons to every square mile. There are said to be only half a million of the total inhabitants who are not landowners.

An intelligent observer and careful writer thus describes the character of some of the inhabitants of the Republic:—"Looking, then, at the property possessed by these Visp-side families in the same way, we can readily understand the moral effect it will have upon them. It will enforce what it teaches with irresistible power, because it will be acting on every member of the community in precisely the same way, throughout every day of the lives of all of them, generation after generation. Such teaching there is no possibility of withstanding. And what it teaches in this undeniable fashion—undeniable because the virtues taught are to them the very conditions of existence—are very far from being small moralities, for they are industry, patience, frugality, honesty.

Without industry, their little plots of land could not support them; not the industry of the Irishman, in the days before the potato-famine, who set his potatoes in the autumn, without finding much to do for the rest of the year, but an industry which must be

exercised, sometimes under very adverse circumstances, throughout the whole twelve months. Every square yard of every part of their land represents so much hard labour, for nowhere has land been so hard to win. This fact is always before their eyes, and is in itself a lesson to them. And this hard-won land, reminding them of the industry of those who went before them, has still, always, to be protected against the ravages of winter storms, and its irrigation kept in order. And every hard-won square yard must be turned to the best account. And all must labour in doing this. Their cows, too, require as much attention as their families. For them they must toil unremittingly in their short summer: they must follow them up into the mountains, and they must collect and store up for them the provender they will need in the long winter. And they must be industrious, not only in the field, but equally in the house. They cannot afford to buy, and, therefore, everything that can be must be done, and made, at home. They cannot allow any portion of their time, or any capacity their land has for producing anything useful, to run to waste. There can be no fallows of any kind here.

With their long winters and scanty means, frugality, prudence, forethought, are all as necessary as industry. These are the indispensable conditions for eking out the consumption of the modest store of necessaries their life-long industry provides. If they were as

wasteful, as careless, as improvident as our wages-supported poor, the ibex and chamois might soon return to the valley.

It is these necessity-imposed virtues which save the valley on the one hand from depopulation, and on the other from being overpeopled. Our labourers, and artisans, and operatives, who depend on wages, as soon as they have got wages enough to support a wife, marry. The general, almost the universal, rule with them is to marry young. The young men and maidens on Visp-side, not being dependent on wages, but on having a little bit of land, sufficient to support life, do not marry until they have come into possession of this little bit of land. Early marriages, therefore, are not the rule with them. The discipline of life, such as it is in the valley, has taught them—and a valuable lesson it is—to bide their time.

Another virtue, which comes naturally to them, is honesty. The honesty of the valley appears to an Englishman unaccountable, Arcadian, fabulous. The ripe apples and the ripe plums hang over the road without a fence, for the land is too precious for fences, and within reach of the passer-by; but no hand is reached out to touch them. Why is such forbearance unimaginable here? The reason is that, where only a few possess, the many, not having the instincts of property, come to regard the property of the few as, to some extent, fair game for them. It is their only

chance—their only hunting ground. This is a way in which, without sanctioning a law which will act prejudicially to themselves, they can secure their share of the plums and apples nature provides. But, when all have property, each sees that the condition on which his own plums and apples will be respected is that he should himself respect the plums and apples of other people. This idea is at work in everybody's mind. The children take to the idea and to the practice of it as naturally as they did to their mother's milk. Honesty becomes an element of the general morality. It is in the air, which all must breathe.

Here, then, is a picture that is most charming. How cruelly hard has Nature been! Look at the cold, heartless mountains. Look upon their ice and storm-engendering heights. See how the little valley below lies at their mercy. Consider how, year by year, they fight against its being extorted from their dominion. Yet the feeble community in the valley, by their stout hearts and virtuous lives, continue to make it smile on the frowning mountains. How pleasing to the eye and to the thought is the sight! And what enhances the charm it possesses is the sense of its thorough naturalness. There is nothing artificial about it; and so there is nothing that can to the people themselves suggest discontent. Their condition, in every particular is the direct result of the unobstructed working of natural causes, such as they exist in man himself, and

in environing circumstances. Whatever may be its drawbacks, or insufficiencies, they can in no way be traced to human legislation. How unwilling are we to contrast with this charming scene—but this is just what we have to do—the destitution, the squalor, and the vice, not of our great cities only, but even of our Visp-sides."

Again, in contrasting them with the Italians, he says:—"To go back then to the valley of the Anza. As soon as you enter it at Macugnaga you see that you are among a more sprightly and joyous people, and are struck with the contrasts between them and the homely Swiss on the other side of the mountains. They are better dressed, and with more attention to effect; particularly the women with their white linen smocks, showing very white beneath the dark jacket, not untouched with colour—this worn open and sleeveless; and on their more gaudily-coloured kerchiefs on their heads. The dress of the fairer part in Switzerland is somewhat sombre. They make little use of colour, and appear to be attracted most by what will wear best, and—if it may be written—will require least washing. The women in this valley have good eyes. They are not unaware of the advantage, and use them accordingly. Their complexion, too, is clear. That of the Swiss is, generally, somewhat cloudy. Their bearing and air are those of a people who are of opinion that the best use of life is to enjoy it. The

Swiss seem to regard life as if they were a little oppressed by its cares and labours. Perhaps the conditions of existence on their side of the mountains are so hard that the people must take things seriously. One respects their laborious industry. There is a kind of manliness in their never-ending struggle against the niggardliness and severity of Nature. This, and their forethought, one applauds, only regretting that so much toil should secure so little enjoyment, and should have such humble issues. There is something that pleases and attracts in the smiles, and in the greater sense of enjoyment, of the light-hearted Italians.

In the upper part of this valley German is still spoken. Here also it is observable that not nearly so much has been done, as on the Swiss side, to reclaim and irrigate the land. You wish to know whether this is at all attributable to a difference in the distribution and tenure of landed property. You pass several mines: some of gold. The abundance and size of the chestnut trees are a new feature. You contrast their feebly-spreading branches and noble foliage with the formal and gloomy pines, of whose society lately you have had much."

He also mentions one very important result of a prevailing Republican view of things applied to an every-day want:—"Since I was last at Berne, it appeared to me that a great deal had been done in the

way of extension and improvement. The place has the look of having thriven much, and of still continuing to thrive. A few years ago a neighbouring stream was diverted, and made to flow through the heart of the city. It supplies, in its new course, several copious public fountains. These are sculptured and decorated, as if the people loved the water, and wished to heighten their pleasure at seeing, and welcoming, and using it. One of the most pleasing sights in a Swiss town—it is the same down to the smallest village—is this abundance of good water with which it is supplied. It is ever in sight, for every use of man and beast. In our English cities there was no want—the omission is still far from being set right—that was so conspicuously neglected. And this, though an abundant supply of good water is not only a first necessity of life, but equally so of civilisation. The reasons of our negligence, in a matter of so much importance, are not far to seek. As the Swiss manage their own affairs, their first care is to provide themselves with what all need; and, evidently, the first thing of this kind to be attended to is the water supply. Their system, too, of political, and, as respects the land, to some extent, of possessive equality, has engendered a spirit of philanthropy; not of the charitable or condescending kind, but a general desire in all to attend to the rights, the wants, and the well-being of all. It would be distressing to

all alike to find any one had not as much water as he could require—supplied to him in the handiest way in which it might be possible for the opportunities, and combined resources of the community to effect this.

Different influences have been at work amongst ourselves. The community has not managed its own affairs in such a manner, and on such a footing, as that the wants and interests of the humbler and more helpless classes should be as much felt and attended to as the wants and interests of the well-to-do classes, and of those who are able to take care of themselves. This has hindered the importance, or rather the necessity, of an abundant supply of water presenting itself, generally, to men's intelligence and conscience as really one of the primal cares of the community. This has not been one of the points which town councils and ratepayers (perhaps because they were ratepayers) have seen in a proper light. There has been something which has stood in the way of their seeing it at all. Then there have been influential bodies in every community, whose interests lay in an opposite direction. I mean the water companies, and the manufacturers, and retailers of intoxicating liquors. You could hardly expect them to have seen very distinctly that it was the duty and the interest of the community to provide everywhere, and for everybody, a visible, constant, gratuitous supply of fresh-running,

sparkling water. Nor indeed could the Government of the country be expected to be more sharp-sighted in this matter than the local administrators; for it had to collect an enormous revenue for the purpose of enabling it to pay the interest of an enormous debt. There was, therefore, something to indispose it, also, to supply a want, the supply of which must inevitably reduce the number of millions it was collecting every year on the production and consumption of intoxicating drinks. These are the reasons which have issued in the fact, that water has been kept out of, or not brought into, the sight of, the inhabitants of our English towns and villages. It was not because water could be supplied on easier terms in Switzerland than in this country, because we find as much attention paid to its abundant free supply in some other continental countries —for instance, in Italy, as in Switzerland.

Everyone who will give the subject a little thought, will come to the conclusion that it is this neglect which is mainly answerable for some of the preventible maladies, and for much of the drunkenness, and some of the misery and crime which afflicts our working classes. The efforts which have been made of late years to set up drinking fountains in London, and in many of our towns, are indications that in this supreme matter our eyes are beginning to be opened. When they are completely opened, a public, free, inexhaustible supply, of the purest possible water will

be the first care of every community, great and small; and drinking fountains will everywhere offer an alternative to the gin-palace and public-house, and in winter as well as in summer.

To the reflecting mind, the overflowing sparkling fountains of the Swiss towns are very pleasing objects, So, to the natural eye and ear, are the brawling stream in every valley, and the trickling rills on every hill-side. There is water, water, everywhere; and every drop to drink."

In other matters he also gives credit to the Swiss Government:—"At Oberwald, three and a half miles from the Rhone glacier, the road leaves the grassy valley, and begins to ascend the zig-zags on the mountain side. We here found the inclination to leave the carriage, and walk, irresistible. This road, which is carried over the Furca Pass to Andermatt, is a grand achievement, for which the country, and those who have to travel in it, have to thank the modern, more centralised, and democratised Government. To it also their thanks are due for the new coinage, the most simple in the world, whereas the old cantonal coinages it superseded were the most confusing, and the worst; for the postal arrangements, which are very good; for the telegraph; and even for the railways. And, furthermore, it must be credited with many advances and improvements that have been made in the Swiss system of education."—(*A Month in Switzerland. By the Rev. F. B. Zincke.*)

CHAPTER XI.

AUTHORITIES, ANCIENT AND MODERN, IN FAVOUR OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

The following selections are made, not from necessity, but from choice. The authorities are not quoted as decisions from which there is no appeal, but because they powerfully confirm the view taken in the preceding pages.

A whole treatise is but commonly the development of a single idea, and the incidental thoughts and phrases scattered up and down the pages of a large volume are often of more value than all else in it. Our purpose is not to dictate, but to exercise or agitate thought which may end in arriving at a conclusion after free and fair discussion. Congenial thoughts expressed in language so superior to our own can scarcely fail to produce an impression, and contribute to the demonstration which this volume is intended to be, complete, conclusive; if admitting of reply, yet irrefutable and unanswerable.

It is not the sanction and support of great names that are here urged in favour of our views, but the strong arguments of competent writers who are known to have studied the questions on which they write. Neither do we attach any importance to their particular profession of principles, or to the name by which they preferred to distinguish themselves from others. A man may be a good judge of art, and yet not call himself an artist; and a sound critic of paintings may not be one who paints pictures himself.

It is not our desire to claim the authors quoted as Republicans, but to claim their arguments as being in favour of the basis upon which all Democratic rule must be founded—a free, unrestricted, and equal system of representation.

The following passages are taken from a work entitled—

On the best form of Government, by the Right Hon. Sir G. C. Lewis, Bart., M.P. London, 1862.

In the preface he says: "My object has been to conceive each of the three recognised forms—Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy—as represented by a sincere believer, and to attribute to him such arguments as a judicious advocate might properly use."

The following passages are some of the replies made by "Democraticus" to his two opponents "Aristocraticus" and "Monarchicus:"—

"No sane man will deny the influence of habit and association in politics, or will attempt to treat a community of living men as an insentient machine. I have no ambition to be another Abbé Siéyes, or to produce a series of free Constitutions from my pigeon holes, of different shapes and sizes. But I must be allowed to think that Democracy is the best form of Government, that a nation can never be well governed under any other form, and that a Democratic people can alone become enlightened and independent in its judgments."—(P. 4.)

"I have hitherto remained silent while you two have been discussing the respective claims of the one or the few to govern the community. But it is time for me to put in a word in behalf of the people whose claims you agree in disallowing. I agree with all 'Aristocraticus' has said against Monarchy, and could strengthen his arguments."—(P. 62.)

"When the members of an aristocracy are leagued together for the purpose of plundering and oppressing the people they can maintain concord on one another. But when the people are so weak the governing aristocracy regard them without fear; their mutual jealousies break out and follow their mutual course. We see these causes in full operation under the feudal system."—(P. 62.)

"The feudal system was essentially aristocratic; when it was in vigour the people went for nothing and the

king for little. The substantial power was lodged in the great barons, and they were pepetually at variance and often at war with one another. A worse than the feudal system of Government cannot exist, although it has pleased some modern writers, from a reactionary spirit and a love of fantastic paradox, to paint it in brilliant colours. The reign of our Henry III., when the country was lacerated with incessant hostilities, and the king was controlled by a council of 'ordainers,' is a perfect type of the feudal system of Government." —(P. 63.)

"The main objection to Aristocratic Government is the danger of entrusting political power to a minority; and sometimes the interests of a minority are separate from those of the community, and often hostile to them. An aristocratic class always governs for the sake of its own distinct and special interests, whereas the interests of the majority are identical with the interests of the people at large, and if the governing power is vested in a majority of the people, the interests of the whole people will be protected and secured."—(P. 65.)

"If a minority obtains political power, it will abuse that power; it is only by vesting power in a majority that its abuse can be prevented. If an aristocratic class governs, the interests of the working people, who form the bulk of every community, will infallibly be disregarded."—(P. 67.)

"My argument does not compel all to maintain that all men are equally competent to judge of political affairs. What I maintain is, that all men are sufficiently competent judges for the exercise of the electoral suffrage and for choosing representatives; and I further maintain that, if they are not allowed this independent privilege, they are at the mercy of a portion of the community which govern, and that, if they escape being plundered and oppressed, it will be owing to the voluntary forbearance of their rulers, not to any constitutional safeguard."—(P. 85.)

"The real life of America resides in the States. If the State legislation is scrutinised, it will be found that the State-laws are on the whole wisely framed, and they may tend to promote the happiness of the mass of the people more than the general legislation of any Monarchical or Aristocratical Government which now is or ever has been. I will add that the indirect effects of Democratic universal suffrage are far more than a compensation for the disadvantage of having second-rate rulers; that its tendency is to elevate the position and intelligence of the individual man, and thus it prevents the existence of any such degraded class of men as is found among the lower orders in all the Monarchical and Aristocratical States of Europe."—(P. 94.)

"You turn against me the comparative rarity of Democracy; but this rarity is owing to its excellence.

The selfish governing class already possessed of power have taken care to prevent the establishment of Democracy, because it is the most effectual security against their misgovernment. Democracy is rare exactly because it is the best form of Government."—(P. 101.)

"Democracy is the natural good of all civilised society. As men become more intelligent and orderly the dislike of artificial and legal distinction increases, and the desire of equality is strengthened. You may shut your eyes to this truth, but it will force itself gradually upon the conviction of the most reluctant. All the recent movements in civilised nations have been from Aristocratic to the Democratic type. We may see this change in manners, in literature, in art, under a thousand different forms."—P. 103.

W. S. *Lilly, Contemporary Review.* June, 1881.

"Democracy is a very ancient word in the world, and has hitherto borne a definite sense as descriptive of a system of Government well known to the student, whether of ancient Greece or mediæval Europe. But the Democracy of Athens or Florence is one thing; the so-called Democracy of France is quite another. Whatever may be urged against the Attic Democracy for which Thucydides has put so magnificent an apology into the mouth of Pericles, it was the nurse of individuality, the bulwark of the law, the mother of civic virtue. To me, I own, it seems to be upon the whole

the highest political achievement of the ancient world. In the Italian Republic of the middle ages I recognise the noblest and purest type of national life attained during the Christian era as most nearly realising Milton's great idea of a Commonwealth, 'where they who are greatest are perpetual servants and drudges; the public at their own charges neglect their own affairs, yet are not elevated above their brethren, live soberly in their families, walk the streets as other men, may be spoken to familiarly without adoration."

J. S. Mill, Representative Government. People's edition, 1878.

"The meaning of representative Government is that the whole people, or some numerous portion of them, exercise through Deputies periodically elected by themselves, the ultimate controlling power which in every Constitution must reside somewhere. This ultimate power they must possess in all its completeness. They must be master whenever they please"—(P. 34.)

"By constitutional law the Crown in England can refuse its assent to any Act of Parliament, and can appoint to office and maintain in itanyMinister inopposition to the remonstrances of Parliament."—(P. 35.)

"There is no difficulty in showing that the ideally best form of Government is that in which the sovereignty or supreme controlling power in the last resort is vested in the entire aggregate of the com-

munity; every citizen not only having a voice in the exercise of that ultimate sovereignty, but being at least occasionally, called upon to take an active part in the Government, by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general. . . A completely popular Government is the only polity that can make out any claim to this character. It is pre-eminent in both the departments between which the excellence of a political Constitution is divided. It is both more favourable to present good Government, and promotes a higher form of national character than any other polity whatsoever. Its superiority in reference to present well being rests upon two principles, of as universal truth and applicability as any general proposition which can be laid down respecting human affairs. The first is that the rights and interests of every or any person are only secure from being disregarded when the person interested is himself able and habitually disposed to stand up for them. The second is, that the general prosperity attains a greater height, and is more widely diffused in proportion to the amount and variety of the personal energies enlisted in promoting it. Putting these two propositions into a shape more special to their present application, human beings are only secure from evil at the hands of others in proportion as they have the power of being and are self-protecting, and they only achieve a high degree of

success in their struggle with Nature in proportion as they are self-dependent, relying on what they themselves can do either separately or in concert rather than on what others do for them."—(Pp. 21, 22.)

"From these accumulated considerations it is evident that the only Government which can satisfy all the exigencies of a social state is one in which the whole people participate; that any participation, even in the smallest public function, is useful; that the participation should everywhere be as great as the general degree of improvement of the community will allow; and that nothing less can be ultimately desirable than the admission of all to a share in the sovereign power of the State. But since all cannot in a community exceeding a single small town participate personally in any but minor portions of public business, it follows that the ideal type of a perfect Government must be representative."—(P. 28.)

Sir J. Macintosh, Vindiciæ Gallicæ.

"To suppose the social order is not capable of improvement from the progress of the human understanding, is to betray the inconsistent absurdity of an arrogant confidence in our attainments, and an abject distrust in our powers. If indeed the sum of evil produced by political institutions even in the least imperfect Government were small, there might be some pretence for this dread of innovation, this horror at

remedy, which has raised such a clamour over Europe; but, on the contrary, in an estimate of the sources of human misery, after granting that one portion of it is to be attributed to disease and another to private vices, it might perhaps be found that a third equal part arose from the oppressions and corruptions of Governments disguised under various forms. All the Governments that exist in the world, except that of America, have been fortuitously formed. They are the produce of chance, and not the work of art. They have been altered, impaired, improved and destroyed by accidental circumstances beyond the foresight or control of wisdom. Their parts thrown up against present emergencies, formed no systematic whole. It was certainly not to be presumed that those fortuitous Governments should have surpassed the work of intellect, and produced all nearer approaches to perfection. Their origin furnishes a strong presumption of an opposite nature. It might teach us to expect in them many discordant principles, many jarring forms, much unfixed evil, and much imperfect good; many institutions which had long survived their motive, and many of which reason had never been the author, nor utility the object. Experience even in the best of these Governments accords with such expectations. A Government of art, the work of legislative intellect, rearing [illegible] immutable basis of natural right and [illegible]ness, which

should combine the excellence and exclude the defects of the various Constitutions which chance had scattered over the world, instead of being precluded by the perfection of any of these forms, is loudly demanded by the injustice and absurdity of them all. It is time that men should learn to tolerate nothing ancient that reason does not respect, and to shrink from no novelty to which reason may conduct. It is time that human powers, so long occupied by subordinate subjects and inferior arts, should mark the commencement of a new era in history by giving birth to the art of improving Government and increasing the happiness of man. It is time, as it has been wisely and eloquently said, that legislators, instead of the narrow and dastardly coasting, which never ventures out of sight of usage and precedent, should, guided by the polarity of reason, hazard a bolder navigation in unexplored regions, the treasure of public felicity."—(Pp. 114-117.)

"A titled nobility is the most undisputed progeny of feudal barbarism. Titles had in all ages denoted offices; it was reserved for Gothic Europe to attach them to ranks. Yet this conduct of our remote ancestors admits of explanation, for with them offices were hereditary, and hence the titles denoting them became heriditary too. But we who have rejected hereditary offices retain an usage to which it gave rise, and which it alone could justify. So egregiously is

this recent origin of titled nobility misconceived, that it has even been pretended to be necessary to the order and existence of society. A narrow and arrogant bigotry, which would limit all political remarks to the Gothic States of Europe, or establish general principles on events that occupy so short a period of history and manners that have been adopted by so slender a portion of the human race. A titled nobility was equally unknown to the splendid monarchies of Asia, and to the manly simplicity of ancient commonwealths. It arose from the peculiar circumstance of modern Europe; and yet its necessity is now erected on the basis of universal experience, as if these other renowned and polished States were effaced from the records of history, and banished from the society of nations. Nobility is the Corinthian capital of polished States. The august fabric of Society is deformed and encumbered by such Gothic ornaments. The massy Doric that sustains it is labour, and the splendid variety of arts and talents that solace and embellish life form the decorations of its Corinthian and Ionic capitals. Who will be hardy enough to assert that a better Constitution is not attainable than any that has hitherto appeared? Is the limit of human wisdom to be estimated in the science of politics alone by the extent of its present attainments? Is the most sublime and difficult of arts, the improvement of social order, the alleviation of the miseries of the civil

condition of man, to be alone stationary, amid the rapid progress of every other art, liberal and vulgar, to perfection? Where would be the atrocious guilt of a grand experiment to ascertain the portion of freedom and happiness that can be created by political institutions."—(P. 114.)

Algernon Sydney, Discourses concerning Government. 1698.

"If Governments arise from the consent of men, and are instituted by men according to their own inclinations, they do therein seek their own good; for the will is ever drawn by some real good or the appearance of it. This is that which man seeks by all the regular or irregular motions of his mind. Reason and passion, virtue and vice, do herein concur, though they differ vastly in the objects in which each of them thinks his good to consist. A people, therefore, that sets up kings, dictators, consuls, praetors, or emperors, does not that these may be great, glorious, rich, or happy, but that it may be well with themselves and their posterity."

Dr. Priestley, First Principles of Government. London, 1771.

"It must necessarily be understood, then, whether it be expressed or not, that all people live in society for the mutual advantage, so that the good and happiness of the members—that is, the majority of

the members of any State—is the great standard by which everything relating to that State must finally be determined, and though it may be supposed that a body of people may be bound by a voluntary resignation of all their interests to a single person or to a few, it can never be supposed that the resignation is obligatory on their posterity, because it is manifestly contrary to the good of the whole that it should be so in treating of particular regulations in States; this principle necessarily obtruded itself; all arguments in favour of any law being always drawn from a consideration of its tendency to promote the public good. And the whole system of right to power, property, and everything else in society, must be regulated by the same consideration, the decisive question when any of these subjects are examined being, "What is it that the good of the community requires?"—(Pp 12, 13, 14.)

Bentham. Plan of Reform.

"The sum of what hath been advanced is a maxim, than which nothing is more true, that every Government, in its original principles, and antecedent to its present form, is an equal Republic; and consequently every man, when he comes to be sensible of his natural rights, and to feel his own importance, will consider himself as fully equal to any other person whatever. The consideration of riches and power, however

acquired, must be entirely set aside when we come to these first principles. The very idea of property, or of right of any kind, is founded upon a regard to the general good of society, under whose protection it is enjoyed, and nothing is properly *a man's own* but what general rules, which have for their object the general good of the whole, give to him. Whoever enjoys property or riches in the State enjoys them for the good of the State as well as for himself. . . . Talk of balance, never will it do. What mean ye by this your balance? Know ye not that when forces balance each other the machine is at a stand? Well, and in the machine of Government, immobility, the perpetual absence of all motion, is that the thing which is wanted? Know ye not that since an emblem you must have,—since you neither talk nor attempt to think but in hieroglyphics,—know ye not that, as in the body natural, so in the case of the body politic? When motion ceases the body dies. So much for the balance: now for the mixture. Good, this notion about mixture, so long as the respective natures of the several interests are kept out of sight. A form of Government in which the interest provided for in this form, behold the simple instance. To this add a power employed in the interest of one single person, and a power employed in the interest of a small knot of persons; in either of these have a mixture. The all of A, how much less is it in the eye of A than the

all of B in the eye of B? When you have solved this problem, then, and not before, say that universal confusion and destruction of property would be the result of universal suffrage."

The Right Hon. John Bright, M.P.

"One of the most eminent statesmen in this country told me twice, at an interval of several months, 'I had no idea how much influence the example of that Republic was having upon opinion here, until I discovered the universal congratulation that the Republic was likely to be broken up.' But, Sir, the Free States are the home of the working man. Now, I speak to working men particularly at this moment. Do you know that in fifteen years two million five hundred thousand persons, men, women, and children have left the United Kingdom to find a home in the United States? What would you think of eight Birminghams being transplanted from this country and set down in the United States? Speaking generally, every man of these two and a half millions is in a position of much higher comfort and prosperity than he would have been if he had remained in this country. I say it is the home of the working man; as one of her poets has recently said—

'For her free latch-string never was drawn in
Against the poorest child of Adam's kin.'

And in that land there are no six millions of grown

men—I speak of the Free States—excluded from the constitution of their country and its electoral franchise; there, you will find a free Church, a free school, free land, a free vote, and a free career for the child of the humblest born in the land. . . Every four years there springs from the vote created by the whole people a President over that great nation. I think the world offers no finer spectacle than this: it offers no higher dignity: and there is no greater object of ambition on the political stage on which men are permitted to move. You may point, if you will, to hereditary rulers, to crowns coming down through successive generations of the same family, to thrones based on prescription or on conquest, to sceptres wielded over veteran legions and subject realms,—but to my mind there is nothing more worthy of reverence and obedience, and nothing more sacred, than the authority of the freely chosen magistrate of a great and free people; and if there be on earth and amongst men any right divine to govern, surely it rests with a ruler so chosen and so appointed."